HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 148 • NUMBER 307 • 1st SESSION • 42nd PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Monday, June 4, 2018
(Part A)

Speaker: The Honourable Geoff Regan

CONTENTS

(Table of Contents appears at back of this issue.)

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Monday, June 4, 2018

The House met at 11 a.m.

Prayer

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

● (1105)

[*English*]

ENDANGERED WHALES

The House resumed from April 23 consideration of the motion, and of the amendment.

Ms. Sheila Malcolmson (Nanaimo—Ladysmith, NDP): Madam Speaker, I am feeling a little homesick, being far from my home on Gabriola Island, but when I think about the number of people who will send the word out on Facebook, especially when Margy lets everybody know that there are orca whales at Orlebar Point, I feel a bit better.

Masses of people stand on the shorelines of the Salish Sea and watch as these amazing whales go by so close to the shoreline. Mudge Islanders post videos all the time of orcas going through Dodd Narrows, which has an extremely strong current of nine knots. These animals have the intuition to know when the current has changed, but they are also determined to push through it. It is phenomenal. We are privileged as B.C. coastal people to live so close to these amazing animals.

A constituent of mine, Charles Thirkill, sent me a note on this, saying, "Orcas are the last surviving species of the whales that once roamed the Strait of Georgia. In 1907, a whaling station was set up in Pipers Lagoon. They caught 97 whales in the first year, and by 1911, there were none left, so they packed up the gear and took it to Graham Island Haida Gwaii. Whaling in the area continued till 1967"—the year after I was born—"and spotter planes were used to locate the prey for the boats. The whales were hunted for their oil. Now ain't that ironic-like?"

He finishes by saying, "We are just beginning to see whales return to the Strait, and it would be sad if they were killed by an oil spill or tanker propeller blades."

They are imperiled indeed. Chinook salmon numbers have dropped to the point that southern resident orcas are starving. They are miscarrying.

The Raincoast Conservation Foundation says, "69 per cent of pregnancies in the last decade have failed, and what should be healthy animals are being lost to malnutrition and other human-caused mortality."

Do we need to take action on whales? Yes, we do.

Add to this the harm from shipping traffic in the Salish Sea. A few weeks ago, the Gabriolans Against Freighter Anchorages Society, GAFA, hosted a screening of the film *Sonic Sea*. It was devastating. I had no idea the impact of shipping noise on whales' ability to communicate with each other, to stay together as a pod, to mate, to keep united with their calves, and to be able to echolocate to find the fish they need to eat. Seismic testing for oil and gas and sonar from navy ships are thought to be responsible for some of the mass beachings of whales, an unexplained phenomenon up to this point.

This movie was made by the National Resources Defense Council and can be seen at www.sonicsea.org. I encourage anybody who is in a decision-making position or who is reliant on the sea, as we all are, to watch that movie. It changed my view.

The whales are in trouble already. Misty MacDuffee of the Raincoast Conservation Foundation was quoted in *The Guardian* in November 2016, saying, "You can visibly actually see the ribs on some of these whales." They are in trouble.

Add to that a sevenfold increase in oil tanker traffic in the Salish Sea. After the Harper Conservatives gutted and undermined the legislation, the National Energy Board heard evidence that deafening noise from increased tanker traffic in the Salish Sea would place orcas at a high risk of population decline. Increased noise was expected to decrease the ability of killer whales to communicate, to acquire food, and to survive. This would prevent the population from growing and increase its likelihood of extinction.

In its report, the NEB states that the operation of marine vessels related to the pipeline project would likely result in significant adverse effects to the southern resident killer whale and to indigenous cultural uses associated with this marine mammal.

This is another element of the flawed review by the National Energy Board. It made an eleventh-hour decision to arbitrarily truncate the Trans Mountain project at tidewater in Burnaby, the end of the pipeline, inexplicably excluding impacts to killer whales from the environmental assessment. As a result of the Prime Minister having broken his promise to redo the review on the Kinder Morgan pipeline, the Liberal government approved the Kinder Morgan pipeline knowing that the project could wipe out these iconic orcas.

They are not just iconic to us. They are a SARA-listed species. They have been listed as endangered, and the federal law on this is extremely clear. It is the federal government's responsibility to protect the habitat and the animal. Extinctions are not allowed legally to happen under a government's watch, and yet the Liberals approved this pipeline, knowing it was the one impact identified by the National Energy Board as being inevitable and irremediable. That is a quote from the report. Still, the Prime Minister broke his word and approved the pipeline.

The federal government is being taken to court on this. One of the many court cases that remain against the Kinder Morgan pipeline is about the violation of Canada's Species at Risk Act. Ecojustice lawyers, on behalf of the Raincoast Conservation Foundation and Living Oceans Society, contend that the federal government violated the law when it relied on the National Energy Board report. They say the NEB used an overly narrow interpretation of the law to avoid addressing the harm caused to endangered southern resident killer whales and their critical habitat. Yet the Liberals bought the pipeline.

The Liberals just keep digging deeper on the violation of their most serious responsibilities to whales and to the Salish Sea. They say they make their decisions based on science and evidence. The science and evidence say that the impacts on orcas are irremediable. They say that all cabinet decisions go through a sustainability screen, yet they say, "The pipeline will be built." Now the Prime Minister is going to be fighting first nations and science in court as the defendant.

There is another failure of the government to act and protect the southern resident killer whales. They were designated as endangered over a decade ago, yet neither the Conservatives nor the Liberals have produced the recovery strategy required by law. The Georgia Strait Alliance, which is in my riding of Nanaimo—Ladysmith, and many non-governmental organizations have been pleading for an action plan, and so have many constituents in my riding. I have had hundreds, probably 300 emails on exactly this narrow point, that the emergency order the State of Washington has put in place needs to be enacted by our government. Those from Colleen Alexander and Kay Morisset are both examples of very powerful letters calling for an emergency order, and saying again that time is running out on this.

Just a couple of weeks ago, the Department of Fisheries and Oceans curtailed the chinook fishery to spare salmon for the orcas. That is a good move. I really wish it had been done two and a half years ago, as soon as the Liberals took power, because that would have saved some orca calves. I also hear chinook fishermen ask why they are the ones taking the hit. They find it hypocritical that the government has approved and in fact invested in a 50-year-old bitumen pipeline that will threaten the whales in the Salish Sea, yet it is the chinook fishermen who are taking the hit by having to cut back.

I am going to vote yes to Motion No. 154, which we are debating today, because I love whales, and the more study we have the better. The more we can be a voice for these unique and iconic mammals that have no voice in this Parliament, and the more we can talk about them, the better.

Overall, the situation is critical. This is an emergency, and real actions can be taken right now, not a future strategy or study. Action is needed now to prevent extinction. A *Hill Times* headline just a couple of months ago stated, "Research and technology won't feed starving southern resident orcas", yet the motion before us is to study, not to act. To me, it feels like too little, too late, given the emergency orcas face.

The government amendment to the member's motion that is before us pushes the timeline further back and specifically says to find a balance between competing claims. I do not accept that. Our responsibility is to protect the species and the habitat. We can take input, of course, from those who would be most affected, but it is not a trade-off we are looking for the government to make. I urge the government and all parliamentarians to please act now to protect the southern resident orca whale.

● (1110)

Ms. Gudie Hutchings (Long Range Mountains, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague from New Brunswick Southwest for allowing me to share her time and speak to this important motion.

I would like to acknowledge my colleague from Nanaimo—Ladysmith for her comments on the whales in her part of the country.

As members know, I am from the other part of this magnificent country. I am a proud Newfoundlander and Labradorian. Our province has had a history with the fishery because of our coastline. We are a people of the sea. Many folks look at a map and ask me why hundreds of small rural communities are spread along the coast. It is because of the sea, the fishery, and our connection to it. It has been the backbone of our economy for years and is still a very important way of life that many people are proud to have. However, we have seen the fishery change over the years. We are going from quantity to quality in some species. Other species are being impacted by environment, habitat, predation, food sources, and elements at sea, and it is on this that I would like to speak today.

It is important to note that while historically the presence of the North American right whale has been a rare occurrence off the shores of the Long Range Mountains, this past year four right whale carcasses washed up on the shoreline of my riding. The presence of these carcasses in our waters goes to demonstrate the changing patterns of these marine creatures. It is a clear indication that something is changing, and we have to do our best to reverse it.

It is absolutely critical that we take more action to help save these whale populations. This goal is a feasible one. By simply reducing vessel speed from 12 knots to 10 knots, we can reduce the risk of a ship strike by 30%.

Since the deaths of the whales began coming to light this past year, both the Minister of Fisheries and the Minister of Transport have been working to implement measures to preserve the population of the endangered North American right whale. Even this past weekend, the Department of Fisheries and Oceans announced that it would be temporarily closing various fishing areas in the Gulf of St. Lawrence due to right whale sightings in the area.

These simple reactionary decisions are important to ensure the protection of these mammals. However, we have to do more. As important as these simple changes are to help preserve our oceans, more information and collaboration are needed if we hope to improve the whale population in the long term.

As I mentioned, the constituents in my riding of the Long Range Mountains rely heavily on the oceans and the fishery. With over 1,200 kilometres of coastline in my riding, a healthy marine ecosystem is of the utmost importance, and whales are one of the key factors in enhancing and maintaining that ecosystem.

In 2017, we were struck by 17 deaths of North American right whales in Atlantic Canada. This number is alarming, especially when we consider that the total global population of this species is less than 450. With mortality rates as they currently are, this species is at risk of becoming extinct within 25 years. Although monitoring the lifespan of the right whale has proven difficult for scientists, studies have suggested that these mammals can live for at least 75 years. However, of the whales that were found dead last year, at least five of them were determined to be under the age of 20. Necropsies done on these whales have suggested that their deaths were not from natural causes, but rather the result of some level of human intervention.

The North American right whale has been listed as endangered since 2005. The species is especially at risk due to human activity, as they tend to live near the populated coast of North America. Some of the greatest risks to the species include vessel collision, entanglement in fishing gear, disturbance from vessels, and acoustic disturbances.

Food supply for the larger animals in the marine ecosystem has been shifting as well. Due to the decline of food stocks, species such as whales have had to alter their migratory paths to find a sufficient supply. This has resulted in some species, such as the North American right whale, becoming more susceptible to human-induced mortality. With these creatures shifting more and more into areas that are frequently used by humans, the risk of them coming into contact with boats and fishing gear increases dramatically.

In the Long Range Mountains, we know first-hand the importance of maintaining a healthy marine ecosystem. Due to neglect of the preservation of cod and salmon for decades, we are now in a position where everything we do in terms of preservation is reactionary. This study on the situation of endangered whales would be a proactive move toward protecting the members of the species that are left, and would work toward rebuilding the population for the generations to come.

● (1115)

Throughout history, the North American right whale has demonstrated an ability to come back and revive, even when its population has been critically low. However, this time it is different. This time, the critical threat to these species comes from human intervention. This time, it is critically important that humans work to prevent further deaths of the whales and take into consideration their changing patterns.

To be effective in this goal, we must hear from experts in the field, as well as individuals in the industry, the people on the ground and on the waters who will be directly affected by any changes that are implemented. We must work hard with stakeholders and experts to ensure that while we move towards improving and protecting our oceans and whales, we also minimize disruption to the industry.

We also must be aware that a group of U.S. senators have suggested that Canadian seafood should be banned from U.S. markets if Canadian standards are found to be less protective of whales than the U.S. fisheries. This committee study, which will come as a result of this motion, will allow us to ensure that all interests are balanced while we work towards preserving the marine ecosystem.

Time is of the essence when it comes to this issue. We cannot continue to lose members of this species and act later. We have a chance to be proactive and not reactive, and that is exactly what this study will do.

● (1120)

Mr. Todd Doherty (Cariboo—Prince George, CPC): Madam Speaker, I want to thank the member for Long Range Mountains, as well as our colleague who put forth this motion, Motion No. 154, the member of Parliament for New Brunswick Southwest.

Motion No. 154 calls for the Standing Committee of Fisheries and Oceans to undertake a study of the situation of endangered whales. I live in a landlocked area, but being from the west coast, we have beautiful vistas and an incredible whale habitat. It is a beautiful area. As our hon. colleague from the NDP mentioned, we have some concerns with the whale population in and around the southern area of the Pacific coast, especially the southern right whale population.

This motion asks the committee to identify the steps that could be taken to continue the efforts to protect and help the recovery of the narwhal, the beluga, and the southern resident killer whales off the coast of British Columbia. It also asks to "identify immediate and longer term improvements limiting the impact of human activities on each of these species and, by so doing, add to recovery efforts and to recommendations for new or enhanced actions". Motion No. 154 goes further. It asks the committee "to call expert witnesses on each of the species...those who might be impacted by any possible actions" and "to find a balance among various competing claims". That bullet right there is important. The reason that is important is because of what we have seen in the past with the government.

I am going to back up a second. The Conservatives are supporting this motion, but we do have some concerns. What we have seen with the government time and time again, specifically on the fisheries file, is that the minister arbitrarily makes decisions without consulting those who will be impacted the most. We are seeing that today.

What happened when the minister arbitrarily announced the closure of the lobster fishery? The very next day, within 24 hours, I believe, there were about 500 lobster fishermen who were very upset. The fisher families, the men and women who make their living in our coastal communities, depend on these fisheries. It is seasonal work. Whether a person owns a boat or works on a boat, or works in a factory, such as those in the town of Grand Bank where I have spent so much time in the last while over the surf clam issue, the "clam scam", they are greatly impacted by decisions that are made in Ottawa without consultation. Thus, I ask members to pay close attention to that bullet. It is bullet (iii) of Motion No. 154.

The final bullet says, "and that the Committee present its final report to the House" by the end of the 2018 calendar year. As I said earlier, the Conservative Party cares about our whales. We care deeply about our marine habitat. We want clean oceans and waterways. I fish. I hunt. I want our waterways to be clear and fresh. I want our air to be fresh for my kids and my grandkids as we move forward. We all want that. When we listen to some of our colleagues, of course, they think we are the spawns of the devil, just ogres. However, we care deeply about our marine habitat, and we will be supporting this motion.

I look forward to working with my colleagues at the fisheries committee, because we do great work there. This is a committee that is made up of all parties and is, of course, led by the Liberal side. However, we have done some incredible work. We did some great work on the marine protected area study. However, again we found out that the Minister of Fisheries, Oceans and the Canadian Coast Guard, as well as the Minister of Transport, like to talk about consultation and our indigenous peoples being the most important relationship that they have, yet time and time again what we do we see? We see no consultation. That is why, no different than the surf clam or the clam scam, we are seeing indigenous groups now taking the government to court because it is not consulting.

● (1125)

As a matter of fact, there is an organization that is made up of fishers and processors from right across our country, who said that when the Conservatives were in power, there were consistent regulations. The group may not have always liked them, but there was consistent access to ministers and it had a seat at the table. This group, a national organization, told me that with the current government, if it wants to see a minister or get a seat at the table, it has to go through an NGO, an environmental group, first.

I have attended events and functions which were supposed to be fishery round tables. The minister is very accommodating. He allows me as the fisheries critic or shadow minister to attend them, along with the NDP shadow minister or critic. However, at the one I attended, there was not one fisher there. It was entirely environmental groups. So be it, but I have to commend my hon. colleague from New Brunswick Southwest for adding (iii), which says, "those who might be impacted by any possible actions, and working to find a balance among various competing claims".

I want to talk about the announcements within the last 24 hours. I am not a fisherman, which I said earlier, and far be it for me to talk about the process and how it goes. However, I have spent some time on the docks of Grand Bank, Newfoundland, and Halifax, and I have talked to the fishers. I have been on the ground. I have been at Sharon's in Grand Bank and had coffee with the men and women who work either in the factory or on boats. I have spoken with them and heard their stories. I have asked them how long it takes for them to go out to sea and back and, for this fishery, it takes about six days.

This is some of the hardest work that anyone can imagine, but these workers do it and have done it for generations. Their fathers, grandfathers, and great-grandfathers, have done it. They talk about the wounds of the past that go straight up the middle of Grand Bank, as there is not one family that has not been negatively impacted by this industry and not lost a family member to the sea. They work hard, they toil, trying to make a living for their communities and families. They expect their government to back them up or, at the very least, when it is making legislation, to consult them. They want the government to bring them to the table, tell them what it plans to do, and ask them how it will impact them. They want to be consulted when the government says it understands it is going to have a negative impact but that it needs to do it to save the whales.

Everyone agrees, and I am correct on that. We just bought a 65-year-old pipeline for $4.5 billion. That is not going to build even an inch of pipeline. We just gave $4.5 billion to a Texas oil company; thanks very much. There was no consultation.

There have been closures announced in the last 24 hours, and the fishermen and their families were given less than 72 hours to get their gear out of the water. I do not know how far off they are, but that is going to put the lives of fishers at risk: men and women, sons and daughters, husbands and wives, moms and dads, and grandfathers. We are unnecessarily forcing them to pull their gear with a moment's notice.

At the very least, the minister should truly live up to what he says he is going to do, and consult with those in coastal communities that his policies are going to impact.

● (1130)

Mr. Wayne Stetski (Kootenay—Columbia, NDP): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to speak in favour of Motion No. 154 to study how we can better protect and recover the St. Lawrence estuary beluga and the North Atlantic right whales on our east coast, and the southern resident killer whales on our west coast.

It might seems strange that somebody whose riding is comprised mostly of mountains, including the Rockies, the Selkirk Mountains, and the Purcell Mountains, is up here speaking on whales. However, I have a special affinity for whales.

When I was taking my Bachelor of Science degree in ecology from the University of Manitoba, in the summers I worked as a park naturalist at Pacific Rim National Park Reserve. Whales were absolutely an important part of our lives, of the visitor experience, and of the ecology of the west coast of Vancouver Island.

This was true of gray whales in particular. Gray whales spend their winters off the coast of Baja California, and their summers off the coast of Alaska. There was a group of six to eight gray whales that spent their summers off Long Beach, so we got the opportunity to spend a little time with them, for the first time, and to study what they were doing there. We donned scuba gear and went down to the bottom of the bay at Long Beach to see what they were feeding on. We took photographs of the gray whales to start identifying them. It was a very exciting part of the visitor experience, and of course whenever killer whales showed up on the west coast, the excitement would just ripple through all the people who lived there, as well as the people who were visiting.

It is really important to have a special affinity for whales, and we absolutely need to do better for them.

I have some interesting facts. Are members aware that whales are, in fact, born tail first? Whales sleep with one brain hemisphere at a time, which allows them to come up for air while they sleep. Also, the accumulated wax in a whale's ear can be used to tell its age and any toxins it may have encountered.

Although there is still so much we do not know about whales, anyone knowledgeable about these creatures would tell us that they are incredibly intelligent. It has been demonstrated that whales are very innovative in their hunting methods, often hunting collectively. I am sure some members have seen the video of a pod of whales working together to knock a lonely seal off a patch of ice. Scientists have also observed that whales communicate with a very complex language. Many members may have heard underwater recordings of whales speaking to one another. Whales also show a variety of emotions, ranging from joy to grief. There is a documented incident in which 30 false killer whales from a pod stayed with an injured member for three days in shallow waters until it died. The whales were willing to risk their lives in order to comfort one of their own.

Despite the whale's many fascinations, humanity's carelessness has allowed multiple species to become endangered. For example, the noise pollution caused by oil and gas developments and tanker traffic can damage whales' hearing and communication. This can prevent their use of breeding and feeding grounds and can disturb their migratory path. Furthermore, Kinder Morgan's Trans Mountain pipeline project will increase oil traffic sevenfold along British Columbia's coast, increasing the possibility of collisions with ships and a catastrophic spill of raw bitumen.

Collisions with ships, entanglement in fishing gear, and pollution have caused the deaths of many whales. The southern resident killer whale is now on the endangered species list, with only 76 whales alive today. Only 450 North Atlantic right whales and 900 St. Lawrence estuary beluga whales remain.

Whales are vital to maintaining the food chain and ensuring that overpopulation in the ocean does not occur. A news release from Fisheries and Oceans Canada on August 8, 2017 stated, "Whales are critical to our marine ecosystems. As they are a key part of the marine food web, the health of these marine mammal populations is a key indicator of the health of our coastal waters."

It is important that we work to preserve our delicate ecosystems, on land as well as on water. Without that protection, animals and plants are easily susceptible to endangerment and even extinction.

This kind of complex system is in jeopardy in my riding, Kootenay—Columbia, where the population of mountain caribou is in extreme danger due to human activity. Forest fires, old growth timber harvesting, motorized recreation, and predators all impact caribou. Without caribou, the whole ecosystem in my part of the world will be impacted, and the quality of our wilderness sadly diminished. If we do not work to protect the whales, the same thing can occur.

● (1135)

If the ecological importance and the intelligence of whales are not enough to earn members' commitment, then perhaps their economic importance will do so. According to an article in the online magazine Seeker, the whale-watching industry generated $2 billion in revenue in 2009, attracting 13 million ecotourists. The whale-watching industry also helped boost the local economy of Digby Neck and the islands. While the nearest whale feeding and breeding grounds are nowhere near my riding, Kootenay—Columbia, my constituents feel that whales are vital to our province, our economy, and our country.

Turning a blind eye to the tragic deaths of the St. Lawrence estuary beluga, the southern resident killer whales, and the North Atlantic right whales would be a tremendous mistake. Our desire for oil and our carelessness with fishing nets should not cost the lives of hundreds of whales. Volunteer groups, such as the Campobello Whale Rescue Team, should not have to risk their lives responding to dozens of reports of whales caught in fishing nets. The deaths of these whales could have been prevented.

Motion No. 154 is an attempt to prevent further deaths from occurring. My NDP colleagues and I support Motion No. 154. The study that would come from this motion would help identify steps to protect and help whales in their recovery and identify the impact of human activity on their survival. This motion was introduced following the deaths of 12 North Atlantic right whales in Canadian waters and four in American waters in the last year, in the span of about seven months. That is roughly 3.5% of the population, the equivalent of suddenly losing 1.25 million Canadians. We must do better.

Despite the useful information that would be realized through the study, I still have a few concerns with this motion. The Species at Risk Act provides for taking immediate action on such matters. The government should be using that route for whales, issuing an emergency order. We would also like the government to take action on protecting the most vulnerable whale species immediately, not wait for the outcome of the committee study, which would not be completed until the end of the calendar year.

According to Hussein Alidina, lead specialist in ocean conservation with the World Wildlife Fund Canada, the motion "doesn't provide the kind of action we need immediately to recover the orcas". More research is not enough to save the orcas, which are on the brink of extinction. Concrete action must be taken. Whale-watching must be limited when they are foraging, and other measures must be implemented within the next few months, in time for the chinook feeding season in the Salish Sea.

The southern resident killer whale was listed under the Species at Risk Act initially in 2003, and action has yet to be taken. On March 15, 2018, Alidina said, "We waited 14 years for an action plan and we're still struggling to get action.... It's kind of ridiculous to see how slow things are here. We need to do better—we have a responsibility to do better." Hussein Alidina is right. We need to do better. We need to expedite the action and do what we can to save our whales.

In a letter to the Minister of Fisheries, Oceans and the Canadian Coast Guard, Aaron Hill, director of the Watershed Watch Salmon Society, expressed that he felt the minister was not fulfilling his commitment to restore the chinook salmon population, putting the southern resident killer whales at a greater risk than they already are. Efforts must be made to protect not only the whales but their food supply and habitat.

With every day we wait for the committee to begin its work, we risk losing more of our gentle giants. For species that are barely surviving, we do not have time to wait. Just this past weekend, an autopsy found eight kilograms of plastic in the stomach of a whale found dead on the beach in Thailand. Globally, eight million tonnes of plastic ends up in the ocean every year, killing marine life. Thanks to my colleague, the member of Parliament for Courtenay—Alberni, and the motion he has put forward, Motion No. 151, there is hope for a plastic-free ocean.

The government must act immediately to give these whales a fighting chance. In his 1995 Margaret Laurence lecture, titled "A Writer's Life", Farley Mowat said, "I have tried to be a spokesman for the other beings who have no voice in how we treat them." We must all be spokespersons for the whales, because they cannot tell us where they hurt or point the finger at who hurt them. We must not take advantage of their silence. We must use our voices to protect them. I want the opportunity to take my grandkids out to the waters of B.C. to show them the beautiful southern resident killer whales, and I believe other members do as well. Let us all give our support to Motion No. 154.

● (1140)

Mr. Nathaniel Erskine-Smith (Beaches—East York, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I am proud to support Motion No. 154, introduced by my colleague, the member for New Brunswick Southwest. Her advocacy on such an important topic is certainly to be commended.

On a personal note, my family used to travel out east to Nova Scotia every summer to visit my uncle, aunt, and cousins, and we would usually camp for an extended period of time in Cape Breton, and along the way to Nova Scotia. We would enjoy different adventures along the way, including whale-watching. As a kid, I was able to see beluga whales and humpback whales in the St. Lawrence at Tadoussac, and I would like to think that others will continue to have that same opportunity. I would like to think that our government will take sufficient action so that I would be able to travel with my wife and my son, Mackinlay, out east to Nova Scotia and go whale-watching as well.

I want to thank the hundreds of constituents who have written to me about the importance of protecting our whale populations here in Canada. Many constituents, for example, wrote to me requesting that our government act to protect the southern resident killer whales and to take emergency action. In their letters, they noted that there is a large risk of southern resident orca extinction in this century if conditions remain unchanged. In their words to us as representatives, and to our government, they say, "The extinction of these whales, and many other endangered species in Canada, is a tragedy that you have the power to prevent."

Many constituents have also written to me in support of Bill S-203, which would put an end to the captivity of cetaceans, and I look forward to supporting that legislation when it comes to the House. Senator Sinclair recently spoke eloquently on this topic, saying, "Cetaceans possess intelligence, emotions, social lives that include extremely close bonds to their families, complex communication skills and roaming lifestyles."

I would put it this way: We should treat all animals that think and feel with respect and compassion, and that means giving adequate consideration to how human activities affect animal habitats and lives.

There are a number of whales addressed in this motion, and I want to address each in turn, beginning with the North Atlantic right whale. Many of us remember the epidemic of whales dying along the coast last year. For the first time ever, the North Atlantic right whales' calving season has produced no babies, and this is after almost 20 whales died off the east coast.

Dr. Moira Brown, from the Canadian Whale Institute, has stated:

> The population decline since 2011 demonstrates that right whales do not have the capacity to sustain low birth rates and high death rates for very long. If mortality rates remain the same as between 2011 and 2015, with so few breeding females alive, the species could become functionally extinct in less than 25 years.

Others have noted that there are only 100 breeding female right whales left, and 17 scientists wrote last year to our Prime Minister, noting:

> What is required now is bold and swift action to reduce fishing gear entanglements and ship strikes. We urge you to take seriously the warning signs of an impending extinction.

As my colleague from New Brunswick Southwest noted in her remarks:

> As early as 2007, a study conducted between the Grand Manan Basin and the Roseway Basin determined that reducing vessel speed from 12 knots to 10 knots reduces the risk of a ship strike by 30%, and that in beautiful Bay of Fundy, shifting the shipping lane by four nautical miles to the east reduces the risk of a vessel collision by 90%.

The government proposed a recovery action plan in 2016, and this motion would be incredibly important to assess the actions under that plan.

With respect to the St. Lawrence estuary belugas, the very belugas I was able to see as a kid, the Department of Fisheries notes that, "before 1885, there were as many as 10,000 belugas in the St. Lawrence Estuary and Gulf. In the 1980s, when regular monitoring began, the population was estimated to be around 1,000 individuals." Today, that population is estimated at only 900. Commercial whaling, just as it depleted the right whales, has also depleted the beluga whales population severely. Although whaling for belugas has been banned since 1979, there has been no noticeable recovery in the population.

A number of factors are to blame for the decline of the species, such as reduced food sources, disturbance by humans, and habitat degradation, but principally ship strikes and entanglement in fishing gear. There is a recovery strategy under the Species at Risk Act for the beluga whale, posted and developed in 2012. Again, this motion is about assessing these plans and what further actions need to be taken.

With respect to the southern resident killer whale, this is the species about which I received so many letters from constituents. My constituents repeatedly noted they were concerned that there are only an estimated 76 southern resident orcas remaining in the Salish Sea waterways, down from 98 in 1995.

● (1145)

A number of organizations—Ecojustice, the David Suzuki Foundation, and World Wildlife Fund, among others—noted that faced with declining stocks of Chinook salmon, their primary source of food, and acoustic and physical disturbance from vessels, which interferes with their ability to hunt and communicate, the southern residents are at serious risk of malnutrition and starvation.

Our government has again taken some actions here. Most recently, in the last day, our government took action to reduce fishing of the Chinook salmon to ensure that there is adequate food supply for the southern resident killer whales. Of course, in the oceans protection plan, a $1.5 billion investment in the health of our oceans and the safety of those who use them, there was a specific reference and focus on three species of endangered whales: the right whale, the beluga, and the southern resident killer whale. Scientists are going to review how effective our current measures are and report their findings to the public, and there will be continued consultations in terms of the best way forward for protecting these species.

More specifically, under that oceans protection plan, we have seen new science funding to develop and test technologies that alert vessels to the presence of whales, lowering the risk of collisions. DFO has noted that in response to requests from a number of stakeholders for better ways to protect whales, DFO researchers will work with partners to develop and test various technologies able to detect the presence of whales in near-real time, such as underwater microphones, coupled with networks that track whale sightings. The goal is to capture near-real time information on whales in specific areas and on whale location.

The department recently hosted a meeting of Canadian and international experts to discuss various technologies, and the group will continue to do work to improve measures to protect whales. Again, there is $3.1 million for research projects, including for the University of British Columbia, to examine the effect of changes to the supply and quality of Chinook salmon, their source of food, and Ocean Wise will study the impact environmental stressors are having on whales, such as noise and limits on prey.

The minister has said that we are going to make a series of decisions that may necessarily represent some disruption for certain sectors, but will be guided by scientific advice and our solemn responsibility to ensure the protection and recovery of southern resident killer whales.

Why this motion in particular? The motion calls for the fisheries committee to study the situation of endangered whales, to identify steps that could be taken to continue efforts to protect and conserve the whale populations, to identify immediate and longer-term improvements that would limit the impact of human activities on each of these species, to call expert witnesses to find a balance among competing claims, and to present a final report by the end of 2018.

In a letter of support for this motion, Rick Bates, CEO and executive vice-president of the Canadian Wildlife Federation said that a study undertaken by the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Oceans "will benefit all efforts to conserve our endangered whales by producing an all-party examination of the situation and how it can be improved."

Dr. Moira Brown from the Canadian Whale Institute notes that if mortality rates remain the same as between 2011 and 2015, with so few breeding females alive, the right whale could become functionally extinct in less that 25 years if we do not take action.

Michael Broad, president of the Shipping Federation of Canada, said the organization supports the overall objectives of this proposed motion and is strongly interested in bringing forward industry's perspective on risk management actions.

Why is this important, for me in particular, and why am I standing up? It is important. Canadians in my riding and across the country have called for strong conservation measures to protect our whale populations. While the government's actions to date are important and welcome, it is also important to assess whether the government's actions are sufficient to meet our goals. That is certainly the work of the fisheries committee.

Finally, it is important to maintain pressure to produce even stronger action. My hope is that when the study is undertaken and the report is delivered by the end of the year, we can identify where there are successes and where we need to continue to move on this issue. My hope is that the report will provide clear evidence of the need for further action and that the government will heed that call.

We have an opportunity to do what is right. Rare in this House, we also have an opportunity to do what is right in a non-partisan way. I fully expect all members in this chamber to support this motion, and I fully expect the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Oceans to produce a unanimous report to address this timely and important topic.

On a final note, oceans protection is important to all of us. I know plastics are a serious issue to that end. I want to invite all members and all constituents in Beaches—East York to attend a screening provided by the Water Brothers on July 10 in my riding at the Fox Theatre at 7 p.m. I hope to see all my constituents there.

● (1150)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): The hon. member for New Brunswick Southwest has the right of reply for five minutes.

Ms. Karen Ludwig (New Brunswick Southwest, Lib.): Madam Speaker, it is an honour to rise in the House today to speak for the second time to my motion on the protection of endangered whales in Canada. I would also like to thank my colleagues from all parties who have spoken to my motion and supported it, and all those who advocate for animal protection, whether in the House or elsewhere.

As mentioned, the motion was amended during the first hour of debate to reflect the unprecedented work the government and the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans are already doing. The amendments also highlight the importance of finding a balance between protecting these magnificent marine mammals and ensuring minimal impact to industry.

The motion includes the need for government to identify immediate and longer-term improvements that will limit the impact of human activities on these whales, and by doing so add to the population recovery efforts and to the recommendations for new and enhanced action.

The motion was developed in consultation with over 50 stakeholders across the country, including the fishing, shipping, and research industries and first nations. It is supported across party lines and across provincial borders, and is endorsed by stakeholders in virtually every industry affected.

The most common concern I have heard about the motion in debate and from stakeholders was in regard to the need for immediate action versus conducting a study on the protection of endangered whales.

Immediate action is needed, and this government and the Minister of Fisheries, Oceans and the Canadian Coast Guard acted swiftly in addressing this need. The oceans protection plan represents an unprecedented $1.5 billion investment in our marine areas as well as specific investments for the protection of whales.

As both the hon. member for Saanich—Gulf Islands and the hon. member for Avalon mentioned during the first hour, a study will not delay action. The purpose of this study is to inform future actions. Our government made a commitment to science-based policy decisions.

The member for Saanich—Gulf Islands included the importance of the Chinook salmon to the southern resident killer whale, and I am very pleased to highlight that last month the minister announced plans to reduce the allowable catch of Chinook salmon by 25% and $9.5 million to support projects across British Columbia to restore the habitats of these wild salmon.

Her Majesty's official opposition raised concerns of the capacity of the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Oceans to take on another study at this time. Those concerns were addressed in the amendments made in the first hour to extend the ask that the committee's report be tabled in the House by the end of the 2018 calendar year.

Not only was Motion No. 154 developed in consultation with stakeholders, but my team and I also worked very closely with the minister's team to best complement current actions and limit duplication.

I call on all members of the House to consider that it is not too late to study all of the options available when it comes to the protection of our oceans and marine mammals. In fact, the House of Commons Standing Committee on Fisheries and Oceans has not issued a formal report on the subject of endangered whales in Canada since 2002. Canadians from coast to coast to coast expect that we, as Parliamentarians and as a government, can and will do our best.

There is no question that the situation of our endangered whales is as fluid as the tides of the Bay of Fundy. It changes hourly, daily, weekly, and we must do everything we can to respond, including doing further study to ensure future protections.

I again want to thank the Minister of Fisheries, Oceans and the Canadian Coast Guard for his continued leadership and commitment to this issue. In every situation, his department responded swiftly to introduce measures to protect our endangered whales. This study will be a complement to the work already being done.

Since the introduction of Motion No. 154 in April, we have learned that a group of U.S. senators suggested that Canadian seafood should be banned from U.S. markets if Canadian standards were found to be less protective than those of U.S. fisheries when it comes to whales. We must take every possible option very seriously for the long-term viability of our fisheries and our coastal communities.

It is possible to have a prosperous economy and a thriving environment, but we must continue to work closely with our industry partners. The world's leading scientists and others have long worked with marine industries to find a balance that provides maximum protection to whales with minimum disruption to industry.

● (1155)

In closing, I ask all parliamentarians to do what Canadians, our future generations, and the global community expect us to do on this issue and offer their full support for Motion No. 154.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): The question is on the amendment. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the amendment?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): All those in favour of the amendment will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Pursuant to an order adopted on Thursday, May 18, the vote is deferred until Wednesday, June 6, at the end of oral questions.

● (1200)

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): We are now suspended until 12 p.m.

(The sitting of the House was suspended at 11:58 a.m.)

SITTING RESUMED

(The House resumed at 12 p.m.)

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*Translation*]

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

OPPOSITION MOTION — UNITED NATIONS DECLARATION ON THE RIGHTS OF INDIGENOUS PEOPLES

Mr. Romeo Saganash (Abitibi—Baie-James—Nunavik—Eeyou, NDP) moved:

That the House: (a) re-affirm its support for the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP), including article 32(2), which guarantees "free and informed consent prior to the approval of any project affecting their lands or territories and other resources"; and (b) acknowledge that advancing Constitutional Reconciliation through a nation-to-nation approach means respecting the right to self-determination of Indigenous Peoples and the will of their representative institutions, like the Union of British Columbia Indian Chiefs which has said with respect to the Kinder Morgan Trans Mountain pipeline that "No means no – the project does not have the consent it requires", which is a principled position conducive to achieving the ends of the UNDRIP.

He said: Madam Speaker, I know it is always hard to pronounce the name of that part of my riding. I would like to begin by saying that I will be sharing my time with my colleague, the very impressive member for Skeena—Bulkley Valley.

First of all, I think it is worth reminding the House that we passed Bill C-262 some time ago. It was a historic moment when the House adopted the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. That is why I think it is important to start with that reminder.

My motion reaffirms the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, including article 32.2. I worked on UNDRIP negotiations for 23 years. For all those years, I was a participant and a negotiator working on the texts we have agreed to as part of the

declaration. We need to understand something about the whole conversation around this in Canada today. People who talk about reconciliation cannot just say whatever they please. They have to recognize Canada's constitutional context. Anyone who talks about reconciliation in Canada has to talk about it with that context in mind.

For instance, one of the things the Supreme Court states in its rulings is that reconciliation is necessary, but that it is also vital to recognize that our consent, the consent of the indigenous peoples, Canada's first peoples, is equally necessary.

● (1205)

That is what reconciliation is all about. We must always come back to that principle. In a 2004 decision, the Supreme Court wrote that the principle of reconciliation rests on the government's duty to recognize the pre-existing sovereignty of indigenous peoples, since it is in some way more honourable than Crown sovereignty.

[*English*]

The pre-existing sovereignty of indigenous peoples has an overriding right over the crown's assumed sovereignty. These are not my words. They are the words of the Supreme Court. The "assumed Crown sovereignty" is what the Supreme Court used.

When discussing the sovereignty of the crown, or whatever we wish, there are a lot of issues, one of them being where we stand today. Where we stand today is pretty significant, I would suggest, because we have an issue before us. We praise people who say yes but ignore those who have the same right to say no. People have said that. There are communities across the country that have said no, and they have the right to say no.

That is our point. I could go on and on speaking about all of these issues, but all of this is about the right to self-determination, and they have said so. Let us keep it to that and respect that right to say yes, of course, but to say no also.

● (1210)

Ms. Linda Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona, NDP): Madam Speaker, my colleague brought forward Bill C-262, which was passed by the majority in this place. My colleague's bill would now require that the government reflect the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples in all federal government legislation. I would welcome my colleague's comments on this.

On two occasions, I have brought forward amendments for the government to include in new legislation coming forward, including Bill C-57, which would amend the Sustainable Development Act; and Bill C-69, which would transform our entire major project review process. The Liberal government turned down more than a dozen proposals to include the UNDRIP in that legislation. I wonder if the member could also speak to this.

The government seems to want to give the illusion that it supports all the TRC calls to action. It is giving the illusion that it now supports the UNDRIP, but in its actions, it does not seem to be delivering on that promise, also as pointed out recently by the Auditor General of Canada.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Romeo Saganash: Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for that important question. I worked on this bill for over two years. When this new government promised to implement the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, a promise it made both during and after the election campaign, I hoped it would be easy to come to an agreement on the declaration and on my bill. After all, Bill C-262 simply implements that promise and the Truth and Reconciliation Commission's calls to action 43 and 44. I thought it was a no-brainer, but I was wrong. I think it is deplorable that we have had to work so hard to get to this point. Now that—

● (1215)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Order. It is time for another question. The hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs.

[*English*]

Mr. Omar Alghabra (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs (Consular Affairs), Lib.): Madam Speaker, I want to recognize the work of my colleague for his advocacy on the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples and congratulate him on the passing of his bill last week. His passion and his commitment to this issue are inspiring, and I thank him for all his work.

I want to ask him a genuine question. He knows that this has been a controversial issue and a divisive issue. He certainly knows that there is an NDP government in Alberta that supports it and an NDP government in B.C. that opposes it. Many indigenous communities support it, and some indigenous communities oppose it.

Could the member tell us what the government's role is in navigating and steering this process?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Romeo Saganash: Madam Speaker, that is a good question. I think the most direct answer would be that it is a matter of self-determination.

[*English*]

It is about the right to self-determination. People have a right to determine the issues that confront them, and that is what happened in this case. Quite simply, it is about the right to self-determination.

Mr. Nathan Cullen (Skeena—Bulkley Valley, NDP): Madam Speaker, my friend from Abitibi—Baie-James—Nunavik—Eeyou and I like to joke with one another from time to time. My background is Irish and that is how the Irish show their fondness for someone. In all sincerity, the prospect of sharing some time with him today in Parliament on this issue, which he has fought for for more than 30 years, fills me with nothing but pride and humility. His expertise on this issue, his personal story, and the stories shared by so many first nations and aboriginal people across Canada makes me feel wholly unqualified to join in such a debate with him, yet here I am. I thank him for this opportunity.

It may seem strange to some Canadians who have been following this issue as to why the New Democrats have chosen one of our few opposition days to bring forward a motion on the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples to reaffirm our support of this declaration. Less than a week ago we voted for my friend's bill, declaring that same declaration would become part of Canadian law. As my friend from Edmonton Strathcona just pointed out in her questions, even as we are moving legislation through from a Liberal government that has promised to include that declaration in the way it writes legislation, the Liberals are refusing time and again to accept any changes to bills we are dealing with right now.

Therefore, we need to reaffirm our support of this declaration because the Liberal government just a week ago voted for it and the very same Liberal government refuses to include it meaningfully at all in our legislation and to apply it over a very contentious and difficult issue, which has become the Trans Mountain crisis, much of the crisis of the government's own manufacturing, its own making.

From the very outset, when the Liberals were campaigning for office, they promised things for the people of Alberta, that they would bring forward a process that would receive the support of open-minded and progressive Canadians as to how to review pipelines. In fact, they promised to redo the review of this pipeline. The Prime Minister said that the government would redo the process, because the previous process, the one that Stephen Harper designed, was a failure of basic common sense and the understanding for the need of science and proper consultation. We arrive at that word again, "consultation", meaningful consultation.

The Prime Minister voted for a resolution, my friend's bill, that said, "free and informed consent prior to the approval of any project affecting their lands or territories" of aboriginal people. A pipeline and the associated oil tanker traffic to that pipeline clearly affects the lands and territories of aboriginal people, certainly along the route and certainly on the coast. Did the government achieve that? Did it fulfill its promise, not just to aboriginal Canadians but all Canadians, and avert this crisis we now face, a crisis that has driven the Liberal government to buy the project wholly from a Texas oil company for $4.5 billion?

I would not want the Prime Minister to handle my private affairs. He just bought a 65-year-old pipeline, which had been bought less than a decade ago for a half a billion dollars, for $4.5 billion 10 years later. My goodness, with that kind of investment strategy, I worry for the general finances of the country.

It may seem strange to Canadians as to why we have to reaffirm this just seven days later, but we do. Aboriginal people on the coast are wondering who the Prime Minister actually is. They saw the version of the Prime Minister, who repeated many times that there was no more important relationship to him than that with Canada's aboriginal people. The possessive in that statement has bothered me for some time, "Canada's aboriginal people", our aboriginal people. It has a certain neo-colonial ring to it, that it is a possession, that it is a people who are ours, that they belong to us somehow. As one aboriginal leader said to me on the coast just this weekend, how colonial could it possibly be that the Government of Canada has now purchased a pipeline and has not waited for the court cases to finish before it says that this pipeline will get built, construction will begin?

● (1220)

Over and over again, the Liberals say that they believe in the rule of law. Do they? No, they do not. There are substantive first nations cases in court right now, from the Tsleil-Waututh, the Stó:lō, the Coldwater, and other groups, which say that the consultation process is a joke and is insufficient. What do they base that on? It is based on the jurisprudence of the northern gateway decision that came down, the Gitga'at decision. They are saying that they are now finding through these leaked documents from federal lawyers that what they need to do is have their legal case ready for approval prior to approving. It also said, "Let 's make this thing Gitga'at proof." It does not say that their consultations were fulsome and meet the requirements of the law. They have said that they must do whatever they can so they do not get sued again.

As Ruben George from the Sacred Trust, a Tsleil-Waututh organization, stated, "They haven't learned...What is crazy about it... is we've (won) over and over again in court." Who are they? The crown, the government. It seems to need this lesson over and over again. What does it do? It costs a lot of money. It costs a lot of heartache, particularly for aboriginal people who are seeking self-determination. How radical is it in 2018 for a people to seek self-determination from a government that has said the relationship is the most important to it than any other in the country?

It also seems strange to me, as somebody who represents the northwest of British Columbia, that we have seen this movie before. The Harper Conservative government proposed a pipeline, insufficiently consulted with first nations people, and slammed its fist on the same desk as the current Prime Minister is doing, saying that the pipeline would get built. We wonder if the House of Commons our Constitution means anything. It seems not to because the Liberals think that bullying will work.

I do not know if my friends remember, but I remember when the then Harper government said that anyone who opposed that pipeline was an enemy of the state, was a foreign-funded radical for raising radical questions, like what happened to diluted bitumen when it went into water, and how would we clean it up, a question that still has not been answered. We think that would matter to a government that states it cares about the environment, not to worry, that there will be more tugs. What will it do when it hits the water?

We just had the report on the *Nathan E. Stewart*, a relatively small vessel that sunk off off B.C.'s coast three years ago. What happened? The second mate fell asleep, that this happens. The alarm was turned off, that this happens. The response was inadequate and insufficient over a small incident that did not contain diluted bitumen, which is much harder to clean up.

What is frustrating for a lot of Canadians on both sides of this issue, those who want to see the pipeline built and those who oppose its construction, both for valid, decent, sound reasons, is that they look to a government that promises everything and does nothing.

This is a very dangerous thing for the Liberal government to do because it repeats the mistakes of the past. First nations are engaged by companies and government. I have been at these meetings, so I have seen the conversation actually take place. The company and the government comes in and says, "Here is a memorandum of understanding." It is a basic business contract. It says that if the project goes ahead, this is how they will handle things like revenue and job creation. However, they say that they do not need the first nation's consent, that it is clear. The government then takes those agreements out to the public, as the Prime Minister has shamefully done, saying the government has 34 to 40 agreements with first nations. He says that they want to see it built. This divide-and-conquer strategy has been used time and again against Canada's aboriginal people, and here we are again with the possessive. The government takes the possessive and says, "We're going to divide you". It is pitting aboriginal group against another, and it lies to them all the way to the bank. No, that is not going to happen anymore. Parliament needs to reaffirm the vote it had, and reaffirm, finally, to aboriginal people that we truly respect their rights and title.

● (1225)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Romeo Saganash (Abitibi—Baie-James—Nunavik—Eeyou, NDP): Madam Speaker, I have a question that is important in the context of this discussion.

[*English*]

It is about the rule of law. As parliamentarians, we have to uphold the rule of law everyday as we pass laws and legislation, etc. As a parliamentarian, what does the rule of law mean to my hon. colleague? Does it mean sending in the army or upholding the Constitution and the rights under the Constitution?

Mr. Nathan Cullen: Madam Speaker, that is such a profound question. It seems remarkable that we even have to ask that question. In Canada's Parliament what does the rule of law mean? It is a valid question because we see governments not abiding by it all the time. Why do first nations win in court over and over again? Because the government of the day does not respect the rule of law and it loses on section 35 challenges time and again.

Some historical context is important in this case. When this pipeline was first built, first nations peoples were barred from even hiring a lawyer, never mind them not having the right to vote. That is how old this pipeline is, yet all these years later, we are somehow still debating the same thing. Do aboriginal people have a right to have the rule of law respected by the Canadian government?

We use the term "the honour of the crown". I do not know if we can actually use it anymore. It has been so dishonoured for so long, time and again. The worse type of dishonouring is when a government is hypocritical and pretends to believe in rights and title and then acts in the opposite way. That does the greatest dishonour, not to just the current government but to this very place and institution.

Mr. Frank Baylis (Pierrefonds—Dollard, Lib.): Madam Speaker, the member has insinuated that our government and our Prime Minister does not care about indigenous people or has, in fact, used the word "lied". Our government has made that a top priority, and I think for anybody who has listened to the Prime Minister speak, he has been very clear on that.

My question for the member is this. We live in a democracy with many first nations, and we use the term "first nations" because there is more than one nation. Many first nations support the government. Many first nations support the pipeline. It is true that some do not support it. However, we live in a democracy. When he speaks of first nations as one nation, saying they are against it or they are for it, that is incorrect. That is misleading.

Therefore, if in our democracy most first nations were for something, but not all, because we cannot expect unanimity, where should we lie? Should we lie with the majority or the minority? How does the hon. member see that?

● (1230)

Mr. Nathan Cullen: Madam Speaker, I have to say wow. I just heard a parliamentarian ask if there is a minority group and a minority opinion, who has rights? If there is a majority group that has rights too, then what will we do about that? My goodness, what could we possibly do about that in Canada's Parliament?

What is the charter all about? It is about rights. It is about constitutionally-protected rights, which this is about that. Government does not just get to say that people who have rights are the ones who happen to agree with it. That is not how rights work. For all the people watching this, please understand that this is a fundamental principle that I worry the Prime Minister might not yet get. Yes, Canadians have heard him speak about the importance of the relationship with indigenous peoples. They want to see him act on that. They want to see him actually respect aboriginal rights and title. There are cases pending at our superior courts and our Supreme Court expressing aboriginal rights and title, and the Prime Minister says that he does not care, that the government is building the pipeline. Know me by my actions, not by my words.

By the Prime Minister's actions, he seeks to further divide and conquer. He seeks to continue that colonial past. He will only lose in court, and only cause more conflict. That is what the Prime Minister has invited upon our country.

Ms. Kim Rudd (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Natural Resources, Lib.): Madam Speaker, the sanctimony of the member for Skeena—Bulkley Valley is quite something.

Before I begin my remarks today and speak to the motion by the hon. member for Abitibi—Baie-James—Nunavik—Eeyou, I want to take a moment to congratulate him on the passage of his private member's bill in the House last week. Bill C-262 is a fitting tribute to, and a crowning achievement in, his lifetime of work promoting and defending the rights of indigenous peoples. It is a bill inspired in part by what he endured as a former student in the Indian residential school system, and by his determination to reconcile with those who had, as he says, put him away for 10 years. It is a bill that speaks to those without a voice, and it is a bill that reflects his own remarkable courage, perseverance, and selfless public service.

I know that the member opposite often says he was not alone in his pursuit of justice, but there is also no denying that his decades long journey exacted a heavy toll on him, not just in terms of his endless and exhausting hours of work, but in the personal sacrifices too, including precious time lost with loved ones. We are forever indebted to him for this, and all members on this side of the House are honoured to have supported his bill. In fact, our only regret about Bill C-262 is that it did not pass in the House unanimously. History will almost certainly question the bill's opponents harshly, but I will leave it to them to explain their position to Canadians.

Today, the hon. member opposite asked for our support again with a motion that builds on Bill C-262, a motion that among other things asks all members to reaffirm their support for the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, and to advance a nation-to-nation approach that respects the right of indigenous peoples to self-determination. Our government is readily willing to do both, as we have many times before. We share much in common with the hon. member, more perhaps than he may even realize, but I will get to more of that later.

Where we differ is on the Trans Mountain expansion pipeline. Our government's decision to approve the $7.4-billion project, as well as our announcement last week to secure the existing pipeline and ensure that its expansion proceeds, has never, ever been about choosing sides or putting one province ahead of another, or one indigenous community before another. Instead, it has always been about Canada's interest. That includes the rights of all Canadians and the rights of indigenous peoples. It is our responsibility and within our jurisdiction to work in close partnerships with provinces and indigenous peoples, to consult and engage as the crown, and to act in the national interest to ensure the stability and growth of the Canadians economy, and to get our resources to market sustainably and competitively.

The TMX pipeline is part of that. It is in Canada's national interest as a result of the most in-depth indigenous consultations ever done in this country on a project; as a result of a significant number of letters and submissions from the Canadian public; and also because of the thousands of good, well-paying jobs it will create, the better prices it will ensure for Canadian oil, and the increased government revenues at all levels that will follow. All the while, our government is making unprecedented investments to enhance environmental protection and support indigenous participation.

To understand all of this and how we have arrived at where we are today, it is helpful to look back at where we started. From the moment our government was sworn into office, we made it clear that there is no relationship more important to Canada than the one with indigenous peoples. We have heard the Prime Minister say that many times in the House and elsewhere. He wrote it in the mandate letters of every federal cabinet minister, and he made it a central pillar of our government's vision for this clean growth century, starting with the Speech from the Throne, which was delivered exactly two and a half years ago today.

I want to read an excerpt from the throne speech so that Canadians can appreciate how it has guided our every action over the past 30 months. It reads:

> Because it is both the right thing to do and a certain path to economic growth, the Government will undertake to renew, nation-to-nation, the relationship between Canada and Indigenous peoples, one based on recognition of rights, respect, co-operation and partnership.

● (1235)

It is because of that perspective that we fully endorse the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, and why we are acting on the calls to action of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission, and why the Prime Minister appointed a working group of ministers last year to review all laws, policies, and operational practices related to indigenous peoples.

In short, our government's efforts are cut from the same cloth as the hon. member's Bill C-262, and they go even further in ensuring that the crown is meeting its constitutional obligations regarding aboriginal and treaty rights. We are adhering to international human rights standards, including the UN declaration. We are supporting the implementation of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission's calls to action and we are doing all of these things in collaboration with indigenous peoples.

The result is that this past February the Prime Minister announced a historic new approach for renewing the relationships between Canada and first nations, Inuit, and Métis people, one that underscores that true reconciliation must start with the recognition and implementation of indigenous rights. Our government is doing this by developing a new recognition and implementation of rights framework, a framework that is being co-developed through national engagement to rebuild indigenous governments and nations and to support a path toward self-determination.

One of our government's earliest expressions of this new approach was the introduction of Bill C-69, which transforms the way Canada reviews major new resource projects by co-developing with indigenous partners a direct and permanent role in impact assessment and regulatory process from beginning to end, which brings me back to the Trans Mountain expansion project.

One of the first things our government did in coming to office was to launch a new interim approach to environmental assessments and regulatory reviews in Canada, an approach based on five guiding principles that included more meaningful consultation with indigenous peoples and explicit inclusion of indigenous knowledge. Then, to enable even more voices to be heard, the Minister of Natural Resources appointed a special ministerial panel to travel up and down the length of the proposed pipeline's route, holding additional hearings beyond the National Energy Board's own regulatory review.

We heard through our engagements with indigenous peoples and non-indigenous Canadians in Alberta and British Columbia and across Canada that the project is in the national interest, that the jobs and revenue are needed, and that the risks can be mitigated. However, we also heard that we needed to manage the risks of the project very closely, which is another reason why we launched our country's single largest investment to protect Canada's oceans, marine life, and coastal communities, a $1.5 billion investment that will strengthen the eyes and ears of our coastlines, the longest in the world.

It will enhance our response capabilities in the unlikely event of a spill and ensure that coastal and indigenous communities are at the forefront of development and implementation of the plan.

It is also why we invested in and co-developed an indigenous advisory monitoring committee for the TMX pipeline, the first committee of its kind in Canada to help oversee the safety of a major energy project through its entire life cycle. Indigenous participation in this advisory and monitoring committee includes representatives that both support and oppose the project. This partnership and diversity of views is essential to advance our shared goals of safety and protection of the environment. As a result of these efforts, indigenous voices will be at the forefront, their counsel sought, their knowledge valued, and their rights protected. It is the beginning of a new way of managing resources.

As Chief Ernie Crey of the Cheam First Nation has said of the advisory and monitoring committee: "Indigenous people won't be on the outside looking in. We'll be at the table and on site, to protect our land and our water." He is right.

The Prime Minister has said that the true measure of any relationship is not whether we all agree, but how we move forward when we do not agree. That is where our focus is.

● (1240)

When our government approved the TMX pipeline, we knew there would be Canadians who would disagree vocally and sometimes vehemently. That is the nature of a healthy and fully functioning democracy. Major energy projects can be controversial. They can divide political parties, as we have witnessed with the Alberta and British Columbia provincial governments who share the same political stripe. These projects can also divide indigenous communities that hold aboriginal and treaty rights protected under our Constitution. Look at those who support and those who oppose this project. There are Canadians who feel so deeply about these things that they will protest in the street and get themselves arrested, as two members of Parliament already have. This right to protest is a cherished Canadian liberty. We live under the rule of law.

I will now return to where I began in my remarks. I opened by commending the hon. member opposite for the passage of his bill, Bill C-262, and I suggested that he shares more common ground with our government than he may realize. There is a very good reason for believing that. It is because of something he said in February when he appeared before the Standing Committee on Indigenous and Northern Affairs to discuss his private member's bill. At that time, the member for Pontiac asked the hon. member opposite if he could articulate any distinction between free, prior, and informed consent, and a veto. I will quote the hon member for Abitibi—Baie-James—Nunavik—Eeyou at length because, as a lawyer, he displayed his great grasp of the law. The hon. member said:

> I think the distinction is an important one and we need to understand that in this country. The right to free, prior, and informed consent, like all human rights, not just the human rights of indigenous peoples, is a relative right. You need to balance that right with the rights and interests of others, which veto does not do. Veto is an absolute thing, and I don't think our court system, constitutional or otherwise, would ever take that kind of view. That's not how our Canadian legal system works and that's not how the international law system works either.

The member's explanation is one of the best I have every heard. It is also consistent with one of the most frequently cited interpretations of what free, prior, and informed consent means, as developed by the former UN Special Rapporteur, James Anaya. Mr. Anaya said that consent "should not be regarded as according indigenous peoples a general 'veto power' over decisions that my affect them". Instead, the overarching objective of free, prior, and informed consent is that all parties work together in good faith to make every effort toward mutually acceptable arrangements, thereby allowing indigenous people to "genuinely influence the decision-making process."

This is the approach our government took in reaching its decision to approve the Trans Mountain expansion pipeline.

The member opposite is correct in noting that there are indigenous communities that oppose the project, including six indigenous groups that are exercising their rights in court. There are also 43 rights-bearing indigenous communities along the length of the proposed expansion route who have signed mutual benefit agreements that will create real opportunities in those communities, 32 of which have submitted letters of support. These signified partnership agreements reached between the company and communities go beyond the government's consultation and beyond the 157 conditions of the project that must be in place before operation.

In addition, the Minister of Finance has noted that since we announced our decision to purchase the existing Trans Mountain pipeline and proceed with its expansion, many investors have already expressed interest in the project, including indigenous groups.

Overriding the consent of those indigenous peoples who support the project or the majority of Canadians who are also in favour of its proceeding is not the solution here, but the contrary. It would go against the intent and spirit of the hon. member's motion.

The goal of free, prior, and informed consent is to ensure a holistic approach to interests through transparent processes aimed at building consensus.

● (1245)

It is the same goal at the heart of our current legislation to modernize Canada's environmental assessments and regulatory reviews. It highlights the importance of everyone in this House to support developing a recognition and implementation of indigenous rights framework that makes enshrining the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples real and meaningful, and that will fully support indigenous peoples in their path to self-determination.

How we manage and develop our national resources speaks to who we are as Canadians and the values that define us. Decisions like these are not always easy, popular, or indeed straightforward. I know the member opposite understands that as well as anyone. He has dedicated his life to advancing reconciliation through inclusive and sustainable resource development. We share similar visions; we have the same goals.

While I cannot support the member's motion as it is worded today, I believe we are all well begun with better rules to build a better Canada, one that our children can inherit with pride and build with confidence.

Ms. Sheila Malcolmson (Nanaimo—Ladysmith, NDP): Madam Speaker, while the government breaks promises at an increasing rate of speed, the whiplash is extreme. A week ago, the government agreed with my colleague, the member for Abitibi—Baie-James—Nunavik—Eeyou, and now the parliamentary secretary has said that the government is not going to support the motion.

A solemn promise was made on Vancouver Island during the election campaign that the Prime Minister was going to redo the review for the Kinder Morgan pipeline project. I heard that a lot of people voted for him on that basis. The Prime Minister did not do that, but instead he added a ministerial panel. Whenever we ask about this in question period, the minister tells us that the ministerial panel, a process that had no recorded minutes, no translation, was badly organized, and where most of the content was about how bad the NEB review was, made recommendations. The question it asked back to the Prime Minister was, "How might Cabinet square approval of the Trans Mountain Pipeline with its commitment to reconciliation with First Nations and to the UNDRIP principle of "free, prior, and informed consent?"

Can the parliamentary secretary give any evidence that the advice has been taken? Why on earth, if she so believes in UNDRIP, has she not built it into Bill C-69, the Canadian energy regulator—

● (1250)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I will allow the hon. parliamentary secretary some time to respond. We do have to get to other questions. The hon. parliamentary secretary to the Minister of Natural Resources.

Ms. Kim Rudd: Madam Speaker, as I listened to the earlier speeches and questions, I could not help but think that the NDP will do anything to stop this project, even disrespecting the rule of law.

The member opposite claims that all communities along the route of the pipeline would need to provide consent to the project, whether they signed a mutual benefit agreement or not. She fails to acknowledge that there are several indigenous communities along the route that support this project.

I wonder if the member opposite could tell this House whether the interests of those communities are not also important. Do they not have value in their quest to have better opportunities for their communities? Yes or no?

Mr. Kevin Waugh (Saskatoon—Grasswood, CPC): Madam Speaker, it is interesting. The Liberals bought this pipeline for $4.5 billion. There were 43 first nations who invested in Kinder Morgan, and they totally supported this pipeline.

Did the government receive consent from the first nations who had previous agreements with Kinder Morgan before it decided to purchase this pipeline for $4.5 billion? Did the Liberals consult with first nations? We had 43 first nations signing on to this. We want to know if they were consulted before the government used taxpayers' money, $4.5 billion, to bail out Kinder Morgan?

Ms. Kim Rudd: Madam Speaker, one of the things we have been very clear on is that with the purchase of the Trans Mountain expansion project, any agreements that were in place with the current company, Kinder Morgan, will be honoured by our government.

As I said in my remarks, through this whole process, there was already some indication of investors coming forward. Some of those investors are indeed indigenous communities.

The answer to the question from the member opposite is that this project has had the largest consultation in Canadian history on a natural resource project.

Ms. Linda Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona, NDP): Madam Speaker, the opposition tabled more than two dozen amendments to the government's impact assessment bill and the bill that would replace the National Energy Board. The member's government is refusing to incorporate the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples as a binding term. The Liberals are including section 35 of the Constitution. They claim to be in the 21st century, but in the 21st century, the world is recognizing a broader base of indigenous rights. Those are reflected in the UNDRIP, which the government claims to be supporting.

The Liberal members keep asking if the NDP does not respect those first nations who are saying they would like to get some compensation for the pipeline going through. They have never heard us speaking against that. The UNDRIP and section 35 say that every first nation has the right of self-determination, and that is what the current government does not seem to get. There is no quota on the UNDRIP.

Ms. Kim Rudd: Madam Speaker, for the hon. member, I would suggest that by not supporting the Trans Mountain expansion pipeline, the New Democrats are indeed taking away opportunities from the very communities that have signed those agreements.

As we have said, this has been the largest consultation in Canadian history. We also know that there are many who have come forward to talk about the indigenous monitoring committee that has been put in place, the first of its kind by any government in Canada, to ensure that the lifetime of that pipeline is managed in the safest possible, environmentally sustainable manner that can be had in terms of resource projects. We know it is important, and we have said continually, and the Prime Minister has said, that no relationship is more important to our government than that with indigenous peoples. That means, as I said in my remarks, it is about building consensus and working together. It is not pitting one group of indigenous peoples against another group of indigenous peoples, one province against another province.

● (1255)

Mr. Adam Vaughan (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Families, Children and Social Development (Housing and Urban Affairs), Lib.): Madam Speaker, one of the funniest moments in my by-election, the victory over the NDP in 2014, was when the candidate from Fort McMurray promised to build the Canada east pipeline, while the same night the candidate in the riding I was running in promised not to build it. In other words, they were saying one thing to one group of people in one part of the country, and then something different, literally on the same night, in a different part of the country. Thank goodness for Twitter. Thank goodness for a little device like the one I am holding, which also happens to show us what the NDP promised in terms of water cleanup across the country last year. If the NDP had won, the problem for indigenous people would have been that the New Democrats might have kept their promise.

Are members aware that the New Democrats were proposing to spend only $25 million on clean water this year if they had won? It was not just that, but $25 million was also supposed to solve the housing crisis and the infrastructure crisis in indigenous communities across the country. That is the level of support that the NDP ran on in the last campaign.

To make matters worse, Cindy Blackstock is someone whose name is often raised by the opposition. Do members known how much the New Democrats put on the table to deal with the crisis in care for young people that the Canadian Human Rights Tribunal said we had to step up on? Do members know how much the NDP promised in the last campaign? It was zero. That is the platform that the New Democrats ran on. I am surprised they won any seats in indigenous communities. I wonder if the member and the parliamentary secretary would care to comment on why we do not want to keep NDP promises.

Ms. Kim Rudd: Madam Speaker, one thing that has been very hard to reconcile over this file is that I am not sure if the New Democrats know which side of the fence they are on. We have the British Columbia government and the Alberta government, both NDP governments, on opposite ends of this discussion. We have the federal NDP, which has mostly come out against it, but not really.

My hon. colleague talked about commitments in platforms, and water and housing. Those are the things that our government is working on with renewed vigour. There were 10 years of a former government where that was all ignored. We have a Minister of Indigenous Services who has had the opportunity to take 50 or 60 boil water advisories off permanently. There is more work on housing, mental health, education, and the list goes on. This is about a holistic approach to ensuring the opportunities are realized for those indigenous communities who are part of this process, and who want to be part of this process. This government is going to stand strong to work with all of them.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs (Lakeland, CPC): Madam Speaker, it is my privilege, and I am proud, to represent all the hard-working men, women, and families of Lakeland, including indigenous people across Lakeland in the Saddle Lake Cree Nation, Whitefish Lake First Nation, Kehewin Cree Nation, Frog Lake First Nation, Onion Lake Cree Nation, as well as the Kikino, Buffalo Lake, Fishing Lake, and Elizabeth Métis settlements.

I will speak about the motion put forward by the NDP today from the perspective of indigenous involvement with energy development in Canada. I can only conclude that the motion involves the Kinder Morgan Trans Mountain expansion as a way to advance the narrative that indigenous people in communities are opposed to responsible natural resource development, and to oil and gas in particular.

Of course, indigenous views of oil and gas and pipelines are not homogeneous. There are a variety of different experiences and opinions within and between indigenous communities, like all Canadians. Therefore, I will take the opportunity to shed some light on the other half of that narrative which is often not discussed in the House or in the media.

I was very proud when the previous Conservative government became the first one in Canada to officially apologize for the residential school system. It launched the Truth and Reconciliation Commission to recognize factors behind socio-economic challenges that indigenous people disproportionately experience, and to start working toward greater awareness, understanding, and deeper knowledge between Canadians.

Part of the path to reconciliation includes economic reconciliation. JP Gladu, president of the Canadian Council for Aboriginal Business said:

> First Nations, Inuit and Métis communities must have the resources to drive their own business endeavours and choose their own path toward economic growth, without prejudice.

He also said:

> Aboriginal communities are going through a demographic boom, often in areas that face labour shortages and lack suppliers for local development projects. Canada cannot afford to lose the next generation of aboriginal business talent. The cost of inaction will be heavy, and not just for aboriginal peoples.

The reason I want to speak to the motion is not just because I want to reaffirm my support for truth and reconciliation, but also to let the indigenous communities in Lakeland and across Canada know that I and the Conservatives support them in their pursuit of economic development and prosperity. I represent a riding that includes eight first nations and Métis communities in northern rural Alberta. As a person who happens to be part Ojibway myself, which is complicated in my family, as it is in many, it dismays me that the left often uses first nations as pawns in their anti-energy rhetoric, implying that all first nations and Métis people are against oil and gas.

In Lakeland, and certainly across Alberta, it is very common for first nations and Métis people to be business owners and workers in energy and pipelines. Even the AFN chief, Perry Bellegarde, confirms that 500 of the 630 first nations in Canada are open to pipelines and support petroleum development. I am inspired that first nations, especially across western Canada, are increasingly agitating publicly for themselves that they want more pipelines, because that infrastructure is as crucial to the lifeblood of their communities and to opportunities for their young people as it is anywhere else.

Let us talk about economic prosperity and what it really means. Around 32,000 Métis and first nations people work in Canada's natural resources sector, which is the biggest employer of indigenous people in Canada. In Lakeland and around Alberta, first nations are very active in oil and gas across the value chain, in upstream exploration and production, and in service supply and technology in the oil sands, heavy oil, natural gas, and on pipelines. In Lakeland, a Cree community of about 1,200 people, the Frog Lake First Nation, wanted to reduce poverty in its community. It started its own oil and gas exploration company. Today, Frog Lake Energy Resources Corp. extracts over 3,000 barrels of oil per day, which has brought millions of dollars into its community. It has over $30 million in cash flow. The chairman of its board, Joe Dion said:

> Together, we have to make reconciliation a priority, given the economic risks and gridlock that continues to impede the resource sector nationally, and Alberta's energy sector in particular. I believe that reconciliation can be realized right here in Alberta's energy sector. It is time for bold action. Alberta is not at the cross-roads, it's in the ditch.

The story of Frog Lake is the story of Albertans and people across Canada. It is about aspirations, ambition, entrepreneurialism, and taking ownership of opportunities.

Sometimes I think my colleagues in the NDP would have us believe that communities like Frog Lake do not exist, that all indigenous peoples in communities are opposed to oil and gas. That is just not the reality. The Fort McKay and Mikisew Cree bands have invested $545 million to buy nearly half the shares in one of Suncor's storage facilities. There are 35 first nations working together, right now and for the past five years, to build an indigenous-owned pipeline from Alberta to northern British Columbia, an initiative that would have the support of every single indigenous community and two provinces along the road if it can go ahead.

The Fort McKay band, near the Athabaska oil sands, has an unemployment rate of 0%, and financial holdings in excess of $2 billion. Its band members have an average annual income of $120,000.

● (1300)

Goodfish Lake Business Corporation in Lakeland employs 150 Albertans through three dry cleaning and laundry services, which contract with oil and gas, one of which is located in White Fish first nation. A sewing and garment company in Fort McMurray, called Protective Clothing Supplies Ltd., produces petrochemical workwear for businesses in the oil sands.

All of these communities provide jobs for their members and employ people outside of their communities too.

Chief Archie Waquan, of the Mikisew Cree First Nation, said:

> I used to challenge industry in my previous years. Now I look back at it and say, "What I have done in the past maybe I shouldn't have done it." There's a balance between the environment and industry. They have checks and balances for both sides and we'd like to be a part of it.

There are significant indigenous opportunities, investment, and involvement in oil and gas. That is why it is vital that indigenous communities be welcomed to participate and why thorough consultation with indigenous communities about new energy projects is so important.

The left often implies that there is currently no or insufficient consultation in Canada, but that is not and has never been true. In fact, the 2014 WorleyParsons study confirmed that Canada maintains the highest level of environmental stringency and compliance, the highest level of regulatory transparency, life-cycle analysis, and notably, "thorough consultation and collaboration with indigenous peoples, in the world." The exhaustive benchmarking of major oil and gas jurisdictions explicitly noted the incorporation of traditional knowledge as one of Canada's world-leading strengths in indigenous consultation on energy.

The uninformed and persistent attack on Canada's regulatory track record has both undermined Canada's reputation globally and emboldened anti-energy activists who are fighting to shut down Canadian energy and exports, which, in turn, hurts indigenous communities.

Canadian oil and gas developers have also long been world leaders in best practices of indigenous consultation on their projects, constantly improving early engagement and relationship development. Sometimes it has actually been the government that has had to catch up.

Kinder Morgan, which was prepared to invest $7.4 billion in the Canadian economy, consulted with over 133 aboriginal groups and communities, along with two non-boundary-specific aboriginal groups and nine associations, councils, and tribes. All 43 first nations along the route, 33 of which are in B.C., signed mutual benefit agreements valued at over $400 million, and about 85% of the owners or occupants on the pipeline route raised no issues or concerns during the consultations.

Chief Ernie Crey of the Cheam First Nation talked about the impact Trans Mountain has on his community:

> In my opinion, if [Trans Mountain] doesn't proceed, hundreds of millions of dollars will be foregone to first nations all the way along the pipeline route.
>
> Why I say this is that, taking my own community as an example, we negotiated really hard. It was really my young council — they're a little over half my age — that negotiated this agreement....
>
> My young council negotiated for a year and a half or more, night and day in some instances, with a pretty tough team on the other side, Kinder Morgan's team, and yet we reached a mutual benefits agreement. I want to stress mutual benefits: benefits to the proponent and benefits to our community....
>
> ...the jobs that result [from the expansion] are not one-shot jobs that are there for a year or two and then are gone when the pipeline is concluded. That is a terrible misrepresentation of things. What we've negotiated will be lasting training and lasting jobs and...over the entire life of what I hope will be the new pipe that will come from Alberta to tidewater in British Columbia.
>
> Already our community is alive with excitement.... our young people every day come to me and say they want to get trained, they want a job, and they want to say goodbye to welfare....
>
> To us, it means millions of dollars to my band alone, a community of approximately 540 people. I know that it also means a lot to many other first nations who haven't stepped up and spoken out, but who also have agreements that are perhaps comparable to ours.

Arthur Bird, of the Paul First Nation, said:

> We have to support the development of the country and its economics, because the economics of the province affects all of us in one way or another.

In 2016, when the Trans Mountain expansion was waiting for approval, Mike LeBourdais, the former chief of the Whispering Pines/Clinton Indian Band, said:

> I want the money from our resources...so that we can pay for our health, so that we can pay for our education, so that we can pay for our elders, so that we can pay to protect our environment, so we can build better pipes, we can build better bridges, we can build better railways.

The Peters First Nations said:

> We are concerned that among all of the well-funded and highly publicized opposition to the project, the voice of Indigenous nations that support TMX has been lost....
>
> Peters First Nation has lived with the original pipeline that was built over 50 years ago seated at the base of our mountain and above our homes with no worries or incidents. We believe that the TMX pipeline is the safest way to transport the needed natural resources out of our country for the benefit of all Canadians.

Kinder Morgan provided more than $13 million to indigenous communities to conduct traditional land or marine use studies and to participate in traditional ecological knowledge studies and other types of community-designed research.

Kinder Morgan did due diligence and consulted with indigenous communities impacted by the expansion and established economic partnerships. Therefore, it is frustrating to see activists outright oppose economic opportunity and security for dozens of indigenous communities that desperately want it.

● (1305)

To put all this in context, the fact is that seven first nations, which are not directly crossed by the expansion, are challenging it in court, which they have a right to do. While they have a right to do it, and a recent motion opposing the pipeline at the AFN made big news, the reality is that it was backed by distant communities in other provinces not directly impacted by the pipeline. Should the hopes and work of 43 indigenous communities be completely destroyed as a result? I do not think so.

While I and my Conservative colleagues believe that pipelines and other energy projects should be paid for, built, maintained, and operated by the private sector, Alberta indigenous groups are saying that they want a stake in the Trans Mountain pipeline now that the government is negotiating its ownership.

Pipelines and major energy projects should be and are rigorously examined and debated. Environmental stewardship is, and must be, continually improved in energy development. I believe that all Canadians want to protect the environment for future generations.

I am glad that indigenous people who are partners in energy development are speaking out that they have been keepers of the land and water for millennia and that they ensure exceptional environmental management as they pursue economic opportunities. It is mind-boggling that anti-energy activists do not see their own patronizing, demeaning implications when they ignore or trample on the rights of those indigenous communities to self-determination on energy development.

Both the Prime Minister and the left-wing coalition have, of course, been totally complicit in the indigenous anti-energy myth for their own ideological and political reasons. The Conservative-approved northern gateway pipeline was supported by more than 30 indigenous groups with $2 billion in mutual benefit agreements, including training and employment opportunities.

This Prime Minister had a choice. He could have instructed additional scope and time for consultation, as he did before Trans Mountain was approved and as the Supreme Court said the government could. Instead, he outright vetoed it completely.

Chief Elmer Derrick, of the Gitxsan Nation, said that the Prime Minister had no interest in hearing from first nations who supported northern gateway. He said, "The fact that the Prime Minister chose not to consult with people in northwestern B.C. disappointed us very much."

Dale Swampy, of the Samson Cree Nation, said:

> [First nations] weren't asked about the financial effect, the lost employment. They are trying to get themselves out of poverty, the welfare system that they are stuck to, and every time they try to do something like that, it's destroyed.

First nations and Métis communities spent two years and millions in legal fees developing agreements with Enbridge, but all that work and all that hope is now gone because of a purely political decision by this Prime Minister.

Then there is the tanker ban, which was rammed through after little consultation with the indigenous communities most affected by it. There is a $16-billion indigenous-owned pipeline, backed by 35 first nations, that would transport oil from Bruderheim, in Lakeland, to northern British Columbia, but the tanker ban is the obstacle. The Prime Minister never stopped to listen to the bands who oppose it.

Eva Clayton, president of the Nisga'a, in northwestern B.C., said:

> Our government is committed to creating an economic base that meets the requirements of our treaty. We owe it to our people and their futures to preserve the opportunity to have different economic development options available to us. We will not continue to see our way of life eroded and consign our children and grandchildren to life without meaningful opportunities, based on an ill-conceived policy decision.

The Lax Kw'alaams Band, where the pipeline would end, strongly opposes the ban and the lack of consultation around it and has already launched a constitutional challenge against it.

Calvin Helin, the chairman of Eagle Spirit Energy, and a member of the Lax Kw'alaams, said:

> We developed a model, particularly for the ocean, that has a higher environmental standard than the federal government is proposing anywhere else in Canada.

The Prime Minister wants to talk about the importance of consultation with indigenous people. I agree in principle and in practice, but it is cynical and hypocritical of him to ignore the indigenous voices that disagree with his radical anti-energy agenda on a case-by-case basis.

It infuriates me to hear politicians speak of indigenous people as their "most important relationship" and worry publicly about the real crippling poverty and the particular socio-economic challenges and barriers facing indigenous Canadians, while they deliberately use every possible means to block financial opportunities and to undermine all their efforts and work to secure agreements to benefit their communities, elders, youth, and futures.

The text of the NDP motion states, in part (b):

> ...institutions, like the Union of British Columbia Indian Chiefs which has said with respect to the Kinder Morgan Trans Mountain pipeline that "No means no—the project does not have the consent it requires", which is a principled position conducive to achieving the ends of the UNDRIP

However, in a recent interview on CBC, Chief Robert Chamberlin, vice-president of that union, said, "when we have first nations that are definitely in support of this, that needs to be respected without question." He went on to say, "we have the divide and conquer of colonialism alive and well in Canada." Many other indigenous community representatives have said that the words the NDP quote in their motion do not speak for them.

● (1310)

While the left tries to push the narrative that indigenous people oppose resource development, it is simply not true, and it is destructive to indigenous people and to all of Canada. It is our job as legislators to make decisions in the broad best interests of all and to carefully weigh the costs and benefits to serve the public good. Obviously, the opinions, ideals, and needs of indigenous communities are vast and diverse. There are pro-development indigenous groups all across Canada, and there are others that are opposed, for their own reasons. All have the right to express their views and to demonstrate peacefully.

I want to thank my colleague, the member for Abitibi—Baie-James—Nunavik—Eeyou, for his tireless efforts to advance truth and reconciliation in Canada and for this discussion on the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. I share his commitment to advance truth and reconciliation in Canada.

It is critical that we examine the motion and its potential implications, as should be the case for all motions here. I support UNDRIP's aspirations, and there are many elements that I and Conservative colleagues support, but as my colleague from Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo pointed out last week, even the current Liberal justice minister said, "Simplistic approaches such as adopting the United Nations declaration as being Canadian law are unworkable and, respectfully, a political distraction to undertaking the hard work actually required to implement it back home in communities."

I do not actually believe that UNDRIP is simplistic. I think it is comprehensive and complicated. My issue is that it is designed as a global, rather than a Canadian, approach to protecting and advancing indigenous rights. Canada is one of the only nations in the world where indigenous rights and treaty rights are entrenched in our Constitution. The crown has a duty to consult indigenous people under section 35, which I assume every member of the House supports.

However, the parameters in UNDRIP for what constitutes free, prior, and informed consent are not clearly defined. As the member for Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo has said, there are various interpretations, and the discrepancy among these interpretations is problematic in and of itself. Some first nations think it is about having a comprehensive consultation process, whereas others have asked for something like veto power when it comes to new energy projects. Obviously, the hundreds of indigenous communities that are owners, partners, and workers in Canada's responsible resource sector should not be at risk of having all their opportunities denied by one individual community that may or may not be involved directly itself.

All 43 nations along Trans Mountain signed agreements with Kinder Morgan. They had, in other words, consented to the pipeline going through their lands. The NEB ensured exhaustive inclusion of indigenous consultation in the regulatory process, and the Liberals added more in 2016.

Article 32(2) of UNDRIP states:

> States shall consult and cooperate in good faith with the indigenous peoples concerned through their own representative institutions in order to obtain their free and informed consent prior to the approval of any project affecting their lands or territories and other resources, particularly in connection with the development, utilization or exploitation of mineral, water or other resources.

I want to draw members' attention to the phrase "any project affecting their lands or territories and other resources." Trans Mountain did receive approval from all nations it affected, so I am not sure why the expansion is included in this motion explicitly, except because of politics, because, of course, the NDP opposes Trans Mountain and pipelines.

Therefore, on behalf of all the people in all the communities in Treaty No. 6 in Lakeland, I appreciate having had the opportunity to speak on behalf of the vast majority of my constituents who value energy development and support pipelines.

● (1315)

Ms. Linda Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona, NDP): Madam Speaker, I appreciate the comments of the hon. member, who is putting forward that she is speaking on behalf of all in her riding, but the whole purpose and intent of the UNDRIP is to end this colonial regime. Essentially, it says that indigenous people, from this time forward, will have the right to make their own determinations on how they are governed and the development of their lands and resources and the impacts on their people.

It is a case of setting one first nation against another. I work very closely with the Fort McKay First Nation, the Mikisew Cree First Nation, and the Athabasca Chipewyan First Nation, and as much as, yes, they want the right to participate in any development that impacts their lands and resources, some of which include oil and gas, they are also regularly in court against the Government of Alberta and the federal government, because their rights and interests are not being respected. First and foremost, that is what they see as their responsibility. They have the right, every indigenous community has the right, to self-determine. There is not a quota, nor can my party, the member's party, or the government of the day make that determination on behalf of indigenous peoples.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Madam Speaker, I appreciate the member's comments. I think we are on the same page on many of her points. I said throughout my speech repeatedly that first nations that want to challenge decisions in court or exercise their rights to free speech or to demonstrate peacefully have that right, just like all Canadians.

As legislators, it is our responsibility—and certainly mine as the member of Parliament for Lakeland—to stand up for the position of the vast majority of people in my community while supporting the right of those who are not in the majority to express their views. I do that. I did not make the claim for all; I said the "vast majority", which is true. The member is again putting words in my mouth. Our responsibility here is to make the best decisions in the broad interests of most Canadians. The fact is that Canada is a liberal democracy. The economy is based on the development of natural resources. The majority of indigenous people and communities support energy development and pipelines. The risk is that all of those hopes, aspirations, work, and effort might be destroyed, and I do not want to see that happen.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gérard Deltell (Louis-Saint-Laurent, CPC): Madam Speaker, I listened to my colleague from Lakeland very carefully. I learned that she has some indigenous ancestry. As they say, that explains it.

● (1320)

[*English*]

My question is with respect to the member's experience in her riding and the fact that she is very well informed about the business community, the indigenous community, and the petroleum community.

What we realize today is that 43 first nations support the Trans Mountain project. However, on the other hand, we also recognize that there are some other first nations in B.C. and elsewhere that do not support that project. Based on her experience, because there are plenty of first nations people in her riding, can she explain to the Canadian people why those who are really concerned support this important project for the future of Canada?

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Madam Speaker, I will not even talk about this from my perspective; rather, I will quote Jim Boucher, the chief of the Fort McKay First Nation, which is not in Lakeland but a couple of hundred kilometres north of our border. He stated:

> When it comes to pipelines and oilsands development, it's clear from our perspective that we need to do more. We're pro-oilsands; if it weren't for the oil my people would be in poverty right now.

Ellis Ross, an MLA and a former Haisla Nation chief in B.C., stated:

> When you look at the issues facing First Nations in Canada there is no real solution other than development that provides people jobs. There is an anti-resource development sweeping across Canada, and I think that that sentiment actually originates from the U.S. and other countries from around the world.

It is our job here, as Canadian members of Parliament, to stand up for the best interests of Canada, and it is the case that responsible energy development and pipelines are in the best interests of all Canadians, and indigenous communities too.

Mr. Kevin Waugh (Saskatoon—Grasswood, CPC): Madam Speaker, I want to congratulate our member for Lakeland for that passionate speech. It is a speech that should be given more than once in the House, that first nations communities from coast to coast want to share in prosperity. She touched on that not only with her community around Lakeland but the entire province of Alberta, and I can share that it is the same in my province of Saskatchewan also.

The question I have for the hon. member is this. Over $400 million is being denied to 43 first nation groups who had originally signed on to the Kinder Morgan deal because the Liberals took the $4.5 billion deal with Kinder Morgan. Those first nations wanted that $400 million to be disbursed in their communities for education, prosperity, and better drinking water. That has been taken away from them. I wonder if the Liberal government even consulted with those 43 first nations that had signed on to the Kinder Morgan deal prior to this development.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Madam Speaker, all the Liberals had to do was enforce federal jurisdiction and assert the rule of law. Kinder Morgan did not ask for one single cent of taxpayer dollars. All the Liberals had to do was provide certainty that this big project, which had gone through the most rigorous of regulatory standards and received support from every single indigenous community it crossed, could go ahead. However, they did not.

I will mention that the vice-president of the Métis National Council stated "The vast majority of first nations are supporting [the Trans Mountain expansion]. We all look at it from an economic standpoint. It's going to change the opportunity for us that now exists. We have 70%-80% unemployment, and it's going to have a definite economic spin, which will give opportunities for new business to be created."

The real loss here is that $4.5 billion in Canadian taxpayer dollars were given to Kinder Morgan to build pipelines in the U.S., while Kinder Morgan removed its $7.4-billion private sector investment to build the expansion on which 43 communities were indeed depending for the $400 million worth of mutual benefit agreements attached to that expansion.

Mr. Murray Rankin (Victoria, NDP): Madam Speaker, I will start by indicating that I will be sharing my time with the hon member for Desnethé—Missinippi—Churchill River.

This is a historic debate after a historic debate that occurred five days ago in this place, during which my colleague from Abitibi—Baie-James—Nunavik—Eeyou, who devoted 34 years of his life to this cause, had the House vote in favour of not only an aspirational document but a document that would now guide Parliament in its relationship with first nations peoples in this land. It is a bill that commits Canada to supporting not just in words but in action something that is known as the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 32(2) of which guarantees:

> ...free and informed consent prior to the approval of any project affecting their lands or territories and other resources....

The hon. member for Lakeland seems to believe, as do the Liberals across the way, that this means we can choose our friends. We can say, "If you are with us, that's okay; we have your consent. However, if you happen to be a coastal first nation, that's different, because you disagree with us."

That is not how constitutionally protected rights and aboriginal title work in this country, and that certainly is not what I voted for when I stood proudly with my Liberal colleagues to vote for our country's implementation of this historic United Nations document, guaranteeing the rights of our indigenous peoples.

I have to say I come with recent information from my riding. The member for Lakeland told us what her constituents think, and I now have very clear information about what the constituents of Victoria think, a community surrounded by oceans on three sides. On Friday, I held a town hall meeting on the Prime Minister's bailout project to buy a leaky 65-year-old pipeline and create another 1,000 kilometres of new pipeline, as well as the tanker project that would effectively almost triple the amount of diluted bitumen travelling on our waters in Victoria.

I thought I would just put a notice out on social media asking people if they would like to come to a town hall meeting on Friday. I did that on Tuesday, and we initially thought we would get 200 people. We got that many people in a couple of hours, and then we got up to 600 people. We had to change the venue twice, and we ended up in what I think is our largest venue aside from the hockey rink, where people told us what they thought.

This was not a rally and it was not intended to be a rally. Indeed, I invited a former deputy minister of Indigenous and Northern Affairs from the Government of Canada, Mr. Harry Swain, to speak about the issues from a business perspective and to speak to the way in which crown corporations are established so as to give us a broader understanding of what it means for the government to take over this project—somewhat in desperation, I might add.

It became very clear, despite our efforts to hear both sides, that the people of my community, including many indigenous leaders around the coastal part of British Columbia, are deeply opposed to the risk that the government is prepared to impose upon them without what article 32 requires the government to do—namely, to take into account their perspectives.

I understand that the government wishes to create a crown corporation; at least, that is what the media informs us. I do not know whether that is how it is going to proceed.

I would like to back up. We have a court case in the Federal Court of Appeal that was argued several months ago. We expected to have a judgment from the court in the last little while, and I expect we will get it soon. The temerity of the Liberals to proceed in the way they are before we have the decision of the Federal Court of Appeal is deeply disrespectful, and appears to me to be a little inconsistent with their commitment to the rule of law, about which we heard so much this morning. The Federal Court of Appeal sat day after day and heard testimony about whether there was an infringement of aboriginal rights in the process that led to the approval of this project by the National Energy Board; then the government announces it is going to buy the whole thing and triple the capacity and double the pipeline. Does that sound like a commitment to rule of law and respect for indigenous rights?

● (1325)

I had indigenous leaders stand up at my town hall to describe their sense of utter betrayal and disappointment in the government. Madam Speaker, you may have heard in your riding what I heard over and over in mine during the last election, which was that there is no relationship more important to the government than that with Canada's first peoples. I guess that was then and this is now.

The sense of betrayal among first nations is palpable, but I come with real sadness today because what really disturbed me at this town hall, which there were many people from all ages and all walks of life, was the sense of betrayal that young people felt with the government. I am doing my best to tell them not to give up hope.

First of all, the election led to 39% of the people getting 100% of the power. Just 39% of those voting voted for the government—about the same, by the way, as happened when the Harper government was elected and ended up with 100% of the power. Members must have heard in their ridings what I heard many times in mine, that this would be the last election that would be first past the post. Our Prime Minister put his hand on his heart and said that.

Now people came to this town hall to be told that the government had decided not to stand up on climate change and be the climate leader that we heard our Prime Minister so proudly declare himself to be in Paris, but to actually become, essentially, the CEO of a pipeline. I do not recall seeing that in the mandate of any minister, let alone the Prime Minister. I do not recall reading that was going to happen. I guess that is different now.

The point is the sense of betrayal that young people feel, the sense of hopelessness, the existential concern about climate change, which I am sure everyone in this House has had a conversation with a young person about. Now the government is doubling down, essentially, on subsidies to the fossil fuel industry.

Members may remember that at the G7 meeting about two years ago this month in Japan, our Prime Minister and other leaders said that they would terminate most fossil fuel subsidies. Canada and other G7 nations encouraged countries to join them in eliminating what they referred to "inefficient fossil fuel subsidies". The declaration said:

> Given the fact that energy production and use account for around two-thirds of global GHG emissions, we recognize the crucial role that the energy sector has to play in combatting climate change.

It is going to be interesting to see what happens at the G7 meeting coming up, when Canada has to explain why it has decided to double down on fossil fuel subsidies and become the champion of a pipeline. In my riding at least, that is a little hard for young people to understand.

In terms of first nations, what happens if a crown corporation is established? That is not a proponent like Kinder Morgan; that becomes the Government of Canada, does it not? Is the government going to say that since it is a crown corporation, it is at arm's length? How many times have we heard the government stand up and say that it cannot do anything about the telecommunications issue or the postal issue, because those are crown corporations and the government does not really go there?

I wonder if it is going to be just the same from now on, because is the Government of Canada not going to be the primary owner of that pipeline? It seems to me that there is an argument, at least, that it has responsibilities now that are enhanced vis-à-vis the consultation duty.

It was revealed through an access to information request that just before the pipeline was actually approved by cabinet, it appears that a decision had already been made by the government to move full steam ahead, so the consultation that occurred thereafter was nothing but window dressing—at least, that is how it appears, looking back objectively at what happened.

The level of commitment to first nations, despite the heroic stance of the government in approving the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, has to be suspect. Will it say it applied in the past? Possibly not. However, its spirit should guide this crown corporation's relationship with coastal first nations people, and they do not approve. They are deeply opposed to this, and, as I said, their sense of betrayal is obvious.

● (1330)

Mr. Adam Vaughan (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Families, Children and Social Development (Housing and Urban Affairs), Lib.): Madam Speaker, I listened with great interest to my colleague across the way and heard him talk about his party's commitment to indigenous people. I thought we shared that. However, I then went back and reviewed the position of the NDP platform in the last campaign on the human rights tribunal ruling where Canada was shown to be short of providing adequate supply of children's services. The party opposite's commitment in the last campaign, if we are talking about how important this case was, was to commit no dollars to resolving it. In fact, there was not one penny committed to health care for indigenous health care in their platform.

What I find really interesting was the commitment around indigenous infrastructure, with $25 million to be spent in the fourth year of the mandate by the party opposite. Twenty-five million dollars does not even build a single water plant. Under that party, boil water alerts would have doubled every year as a result of their underfunding.

The member opposite speaks as if he cares about indigenous rights. Why did he run for a party that put no dollars into indigenous infrastructure, no dollars into indigenous health care, and no dollars to transform the relationship he says his party cares about?

● (1335)

Mr. Murray Rankin: Madam Speaker, while I appreciate the lecture by my colleague across the way, I do remember that platform, and the Liberals' one as well. Two things stood out for me, as I indicated in my remarks, the first being that it would be the last election with first past the post. The second was that suddenly the relationship with first nations was the most important one among Canadians.

I do not know about members but—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Order. I just want to remind parliamentary secretaries that they should be even more respectful of the rules of order within the House, and allow the member in this case to speak. If they have other questions, they can stand up to ask them.

The hon. member for Victoria.

Mr. Murray Rankin: Madam Speaker, the member referred to boil water advisories. I understand that the shortfall for clean water on first nations reserves is $3.2 billion. The cost of just buying this leaky 65-year old pipeline was $4.5 billion. I do not think we need a lecture on skewed priorities by the member.

Ms. Marilyn Gladu (Sarnia—Lambton, CPC): Madam Speaker, I agree with my colleague when he says that the government is all talk and no action. It committed to $8.4 billion to eliminate boil water advisories on reserves, and we now have more of them than when we started. That is a total shame. In terms of Liberal priorities, for the low price of $10 million, they could have had 3,000 well-paying jobs, fixed the hole in rural internet service, and opened the border at Sambra in Sarnia, Lambton.

I wonder if the member could elaborate on his feelings about the government's priority with respect to the first nations people?

Mr. Murray Rankin: Madam Speaker, I appreciate the member's reference to boil water advisories.

The other thing the government said that it bought with the pipeline is 15,000 jobs, which of course I heard the Minister of Finance say, and I gasp at that. Robyn Allan, the former CEO of ICBC and an economist for Central Credit Union, has done a thorough analysis this. She says there is no number even approaching that, that it is something that was spitballed by the Bank of Nova Scotia and suddenly became the holy grail for the government. I think the pipeline would mean 90 jobs in my province, going forward, after its construction. In terms of the cost-benefit analysis, I really do not get it. However, there is also another kind of analysis. That is the risk-benefit analysis. Even though I would concede that the risk of a catastrophic spill is small, the consequences of a catastrophic spill are enormous.

I was asked a question at the town hall, and I promised to ask the Prime Minister it. I will do it now. In what way does this project help Canada transition to a low carbon economy?

Mr. Kevin Waugh (Saskatoon—Grasswood, CPC): Madam Speaker, there have been different speeches by members from Lakeland to Victoria, but 43 first nations signed onto Kinder Morgan, which would have given them $400 million.

Could the member for Victoria comment on the graduation rates on reserves right now, particularly as I believe that only 44% of first nation people between the ages of 18 to 24 living on reserves have completed high school? I am just wondering if that $400 million would, in fact, help those in need of actually graduating from high school.

Mr. Murray Rankin: Madam Speaker, I concede that my colleague is right that it is very different in Lakeland and Victoria. I have a hard time understanding what the graduation rates on reserves might mean. It might mean that the government could choose to put money into that, but the government, of course, has the ability to choose to put money anywhere it wishes. We do not know.

Ms. Georgina Jolibois (Desnethé—Missinippi—Churchill River, NDP):

[*Member spoke in Dene*]

[*English*]

Today, I am happy to speak in support of the motion presented by the member for Abitibi—Baie-James—Nunavik—Eeyou and would like to congratulate him on his lifetime achievement award for advancing the rights of first nations, Métis, and Inuit people. It is humbling to sit in the House of Commons next to the hon. member and to work across the hall from him every day.

One of the first things that surprised me when I was elected to represent the people of Desnethé—Missinippi—Churchill River was the number of invitations I receive here in Ottawa, as I am sure my colleague can attest to. Our offices receive hundreds of invitations every month for events across the city, such as film screenings, meetings of foreign dignitaries, lunches with community stakeholders, issue briefings with industry professionals, book launches, protests, and more. At virtually every single one of these events, there is one thing that is always said, which is that we recognize that we are on the unceded and unsurrendered territory of the Algonquin people.

Statements like these are important. Recognizing the unsurrendered land of first nations, Métis, and Inuit people is an important step toward our national project of reconciliation. Acknowledging that the lands we live on have their own history reminds all Canadians of our colonial history and the injustices committed against first nations, Métis, and Inuit people.

Just this past week, the Liberal government has proven that the recognition of our people is just words and false promises. When the Liberal government decided to purchase the Kinder Morgan pipeline assets for $4.5 billion, it said it was in the best interests of Canadians to purchase that leaky 65-year-old pipeline.

This is the same government that feels the need to tell us every day that climate change is real and that we should invest in green technology. This is the same government that tells us that it believes debate is important while pushing for time allocation and presenting omnibus bills. This is from the same government that promised changes to the electoral system, but abandoned that promise. This is coming from the same government that has tirelessly told us that its relationship with first nations, Métis, and Inuit people is the most important relationship it has. This is the same government that believes in a nation-to-nation consultation and insists on denying the rights of first nations, Métis, and Inuit people. This is the same government that will not support my private member's bill to make National Indigenous Peoples Day a statutory holiday.

● (1340)

The government is not protecting the rivers and lakes that first nations, Métis, and Inuit people use every day for hunting, fishing, and trapping. First nation, Métis, and Inuit people believe that water is life, and protecting it from waste, pollution, and damage is crucial. Nothing about the government's purchase of the pipeline would do anything to protect our land or our water. It is awful that the government thinks it can hide this fact. First nation, Métis, and Inuit people strongly believe that water is life and they will protect it at all costs.

We have heard repeatedly from the Minister of Natural Resources that the Liberals have consulted with 43 first nations who have given their consent for this project, which is enough for the Liberals to purchase this pipeline and force this project. If the government did its due diligence, it would find that there are far more first nations, Métis, and Inuit people who are opposed to the pipeline than in support of it.

We could go back and forth all day with lists of who supports and who opposes this pipeline, but I believe that today's motion is more about the principle than resentment.

[*Member speaks in Dene*]

[*English*]

I am a Dene woman who comes from northern Saskatchewan, and 75% of the people in my riding identify as first nation or Métis people. Many struggle to find work, affordable housing, access to clean water, or health care that meets their needs.

The Kinder Morgan pipeline project does not reach my home province, but the decisions the government has made are felt by the people back home. Too often I am told that our community lacks the resources to do a number of projects. There is never enough money for clean water, mental health, youth programs, or health care. Therefore, it comes as a shock to many in the north that there is now enough money for pipelines. People at home have been encouraged by the government's action on UNDRIP and the indigenous languages act, and love to see first nation issues placed at the highest importance in Ottawa, but have seen their hopes for a better future crushed by the news that companies in Texas are more important than they.

However, not all hope is lost. Folks back home regularly tell me how inspired they are by the resilience of the first nation people in British Columbia. We recognize the importance of the elders guiding us against the pipeline, and we are inspired by their stories of resilience and strength to protect the rights of first nations, Métis, and Inuit people.

We recognize the bravery of the first nations challenging the government in court. We stand firmly with the British Columbia Assembly of First Nations, the Union of British Columbia Indian Chiefs, and the Assembly of First Nations. We raise our voices in support of the protesters on the ground opposing this pipeline. The fight for first nations, Métis, and Inuit rights has been going on for generations, and we will continue that fight in the future.

The concern of folks in northern Saskatchewan is that if the rights of first nations people in B.C. can be violated today, then perhaps it will be those of the people of Saskatchewan next. We hear so much about the duty to consult, the idea of free, prior, and informed consent, and how important it is to the Liberal government, but when it comes down to actually getting that consent, the government has shown that words are more important to it than action.

We hear from companies all the time about how they have done consultations with first nations, Métis, and Inuit people. Often, these consultations are single two-hour meetings held in languages that are not spoken by the locals. We know that when documents are signed, the vast majority of first nations, Métis, and Inuit peoples are uninformed and intentionally excluded.

● (1345)

A true consultation, with a goal of obtaining free, prior, and informed consent, takes time. First nations, Métis, and Inuit peoples are the ultimate judges on whether the consultation process has been meaningful.

● (1350)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Unfortunately the time is up but I am sure the hon. member will have time to add anything during the questions and comments.

The hon. member for Beaches—East York

Mr. Nathaniel Erskine-Smith (Beaches—East York, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I find this to be an incredibly difficult aspect of the Trans Mountain expansion approval and now purchase. I have two specific questions.

First, if the Federal Court determines that there is adequate consultation or if the Federal Court sets a path for additional consultation that it deems to be adequate, is that sufficient for the member?

Second, when we have dozens of indigenous communities that have bought into support for the pipeline, how does she reconcile the opposition with that support?

Ms. Georgina Jolibois: Madam Speaker, as I stated in my presentation, the rights of indigenous peoples, the rights of our elders, the right to live and use the land, rivers, and waters across Canada are very important. The rights of all first nations, Métis, and Inuit people across Canada from coast to coast to coast are very significant. They do not stop. My rights are very important. The rights of the elders who are protesting are very important.

Again, the language the government is using, the language the court is using, are the languages of the foreign entity, of the settler sentiment, not of indigenous people. I would like to ask the government why it has selectively chosen just a few first nations in its consultation process, deliberately excluding the majority.

Mr. Kevin Waugh (Saskatoon—Grasswood, CPC): Madam Speaker, 43 first nations bands have signed onto Trans Mountain along with Kinder Morgan. However, we hear today that they really have not been consulted. For the member for Desnethé—Missinippi—Churchill River, a colleague from Saskatchewan, I will say this. Every group in my province wants to see prosperity in my province for first nations on reserve. There is talk of a pipeline, with first nations groups in my province of Saskatchewan joining together.

Would the member join with them to help many of these communities get out of poverty? In our province, we have a number of poverty problems on first nations reserves. Many groups in my province are getting together now and are proposing a pipeline of their own to join on with this.

Ms. Georgina Jolibois: Madam Speaker, I am glad my colleague on my right has asked this very important question. I have one question for the Conservative side. When we were voting on this very important bill just the other day in the House, why were two members of Parliament high-fiving when they voted against the bill? That is very shameful.

I come from northern Saskatchewan and my home is there. For years and years under the Conservative government, both provincially and federally, as well as under the Liberal government on the other side, we the indigenous people in northern Saskatchewan, the Dene, the Cree, the Michif, the Métis and everyone else, have been fighting so hard to be included in the prosperity about which he speaks. How come for all these years, the north has never been included in the discussions, everything around prosperity, and everything else?

Mr. Richard Cannings (South Okanagan—West Kootenay, NDP): Madam Speaker, my colleague from northern Saskatchewan always provides such a strong voice for indigenous peoples in this place. What is her view on what a true nation-to-nation relationship is and how that would relate to today's debate?

Ms. Georgina Jolibois:

[*Member spoke in Dene*]

[*English*]

Madam Speaker, the way for nation to nation as indigenous people, Cree, Dene, Michif, Inuit from coast to coast to coast is to include the elders, the youth, the families in a setting where we have an opportunity to voice our concerns and our matters.

● (1355)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Before resuming debate, I want to remind the member that I will unfortunately have to interrupt him for question period.

The hon. member for Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge.

Mr. Dan Ruimy (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I am thankful for the opportunity to speak to the motion brought forward by the member for Abitibi—Baie-James—Nunavik—Eeyou.

I would like to begin by acknowledging that we are on the traditional territory of the Algonquin people.

In 2016, Canada announced its full support for the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples without qualification, with a commitment to its full and effective implementation.

Ms. Sheila Malcolmson: Madam Speaker, on a point of order, I believe I was next in the speaking order.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): First, the member did not rise to speak. Second, a Liberal is next on the roster. Since nobody stood to speak on that side, the member for Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge has the right to debate now.

The hon. member for Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge.

Mr. Dan Ruimy: Madam Speaker, the Government of Canada believes indigenous people have the right to participate in decision-making in matters that affect their rights and that indigenous governments' laws and jurisdictions must be respected. That is why, as part of the Government of Canada's commitment to a renewed relationship with first nations, Inuit, and Métis nations, Canada will aim to secure free, prior, and informed consent when it proposes to take actions that impact the rights of indigenous peoples. This principle builds on, but goes beyond, the legal duty to consult.

While our government recently supported Bill C-262 as a good next step toward renewing Canada's relationship with indigenous peoples, a single legislative approach to implementing the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples cannot achieve our twofold goal of transformed indigenous-crown relations and improved standards of living in indigenous communities.

In order to fully adopt and implement the declaration and meet the promise of section 35 of our Constitution, more must be done. To that end, on February 14, the Prime Minister announced that the Government of Canada would ensure that a rights-based approach would be the foundation of all crown-indigenous relations. We are doing this by developing a full partnership with first nations, Inuit, and Métis people, a new recognition and implementation of indigenous rights framework. While the contents are being determined through engagement, it is anticipated that the framework will include legislative and policy changes needed to operationalize the recognition and implementation of the rights of indigenous peoples.

The Speaker: Order, please. I apologize to the member for interrupting, but we have to proceed to statements by members. The member will have 17 minutes and 40 seconds remaining in his speech when the House returns to this topic.

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[*English*]

FREDERICK ENGELBRECHT

Mr. Bob Bratina (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, one of the last survivors of the Dieppe raid of World War II, my dear friend Frederick Engelbrecht, has died.

Fred was 22 years old when the Royal Hamilton Light Infantry hit the beach in France on August 19, 1942. By that night, 916 soldiers were dead, including 197 of his regimental comrades. Fred was captured after firing at the enemy while the last survivors were being evacuated.

Fred's granddaughters Amanda and Shari moved us all to tears, talking especially about not hating those he fought and who took him prisoner but rather emphasizing the goodness that people and life had to offer.

For 34 years after his return, Fred served with the Hamilton fire department. Chief Cunliffe spoke of his outstanding qualities as a professional firefighter.

Fred was a soldier, fireman, husband, father, grandfather, and great-grandfather, friend. May Fred rest in peace. We will remember him.

* * *

● (1400)

WEDDING ANNIVERSARY

Mrs. Rosemarie Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster, CPC): Mr. Speaker, today is a special day for me. It is my wedding anniversary. On this occasion, I would like to take an opportunity to honour my husband Adam.

Adam truly understands what it takes to be a supportive partner. He is a great father and role model for our two children. Through his actions, he is teaching them how a man can truly be a feminist. Currently he has put his career on hold to be there for our children 24/7.

Not only is he a source of strength and stability in our home, Adam also supports me in this role and accompanies me to events throughout the riding.

I would like to thank Adam for being a true feminist, by encouraging me, helping me, believing in me, and telling me never to give up. Most important, I would like to thank him for setting a high standard for our children.

* * *

[*Translation*]

SQUADRON 687 RICHELIEU LAVAL

Mrs. Eva Nassif (Vimy, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on May 12, I had the honour of attending Squadron 687 Richelieu Laval's 60th annual ceremony. Cadet programs give children and teens wonderful opportunities to participate in activities and develop all kinds of important skills and attitudes, individually or as part of a team. These activities help build discipline, teach cadets to work with others, and help them forge long-lasting friendships.

I want to thank everyone involved with Squadron 687 Richelieu Laval for everything they have done for our community and our children and for everything they continue to do. I particularly want to thank Lena Assaf, a long-time volunteer, for her dedication to supporting the cadets throughout the program.

Congratulations on another successful annual ceremony. I wish you many more to come.

* * *

[*English*]

OCEANS DAY SUNDAY

Ms. Sheila Malcolmson (Nanaimo—Ladysmith, NDP): Mr. Speaker, to celebrate oceans and defend the coast, Oceans Day Sunday on my home island of Gabriola drew hundreds, and on Friday, Nanaimo celebrates too. We are all in this together. Healthy oceans keep us healthy.

Clean coastal waters generate tens of thousands of B.C. jobs and billions in economic activity, from tourism to film to fisheries.

However, the ocean is taking the brunt of climate change and oil tanker spills from the Prime Minister's pipeline risk everything. So B.C. people are taking action.

Thirty-six thousand businesses just voted for the Liberals to include recycling solutions in their abandoned vessel bill. New Democrats built plans to end marine plastic pollution and move open-net salmon farms on land. Coastal folks want endangered orcas protected and oil spill response tightened. We are going to stop freighters' free parking in the Salish Sea.

We owe our oceans everything. It is far past time to honour them with action.

* * *

[*Translation*]

DECEASED FORMER PARLIAMENTARIANS

Mr. Marc Serré (Nickel Belt, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, a ceremony in honour of deceased former parliamentarians was held today.

[*English*]

Today, my mother Jeannine, sister Lynne, and I attended a ceremony to pay tribute to these men and women who made a difference. We commemorated the memory of my late father Gaetan Serre, former MP for Nickel Belt, former colleagues Arnold Chan, Gord Brown, and many others.

Although the pain from a loss runs deep, I hope all those who suffered the loss of loved ones can find peace in their accomplishments. They were passionate and dedicated people.

I am proud of my father's legacy, a very devoted advocate for social justice.

[*Translation*]

Today I invite my colleagues to join the families in honouring the memory of all former parliamentarians who passed away in the last year. Thank you. *Merci. Meegwetch.*

* * *

BEAUPORT—LIMOILOU

Mr. Alupa Clarke (Beauport—Limoilou, CPC): Mr. Speaker, according to the parliamentary calendar, we will in all likelihood be back in our respective ridings within three or four weeks' time.

Personally, I plan to get out and meet with my constituents nonstop for two and a half months, whether in my constituency office or by doing my summer door-knocking, two or three days a week, between 4 p.m. and 6 p.m. I will also visit community organizations and attend public events in various neighbourhoods.

I am also organizing two key events. The first event will be held from 11 a.m. to 3 p.m. on July 1 to celebrate Canada Day at the Maison Girardin, a historic residence on Royale Avenue, where there will be popcorn, hotdogs, and military music provided by the Voltigeurs.

The second event will be my Beauport—Limoilou summer party. It will be held from 11 a.m. to 3 p.m. on August 18 at the Domaine de Maizerets. Complimentary hotdogs and corn on the cob from Île d'Orléans will be served. Over 3,000 people attended last year. I hope to see at least 4,000 people this year. Come one, come all, to the Domaine de Maizerets on August 18.

* * *

● (1405)

[*English*]

PORTUGAL HERITAGE MONTH

Mr. Peter Fonseca (Mississauga East—Cooksville, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in June we celebrate Portugal Heritage Month and the great contributions made by Canadians of Portuguese descent. The Luso community in Canada numbers over half a million members, and we thank them for their contributions in shaping communities from coast to coast to coast.

Portugal Day, June 10, is commemorated both in Portugal and around the world, by Portuguese honouring the 16th century poet, Luís Vaz de Camões, whose prose captured Portugal's age of discovery.

Next week, we will host our third annual Portugal Day on the Hill. It is a special day of pride for me, both as a Portuguese immigrant who came to Canada at the age of two with my family, and as the MP for Mississauga East—Cooksville and resident of Mississauga, a city which over 20,000 Portuguese Canadians call home.

It was an honour for the community to have Portuguese Prime Minister António Costa's official visit to Canada, to deepen our people to people—

* * *

MARKHAM THUNDER

Ms. Mary Ng (Markham—Thornhill, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a Markham Thunder fan and a proud supporter of women's hockey in Canada.

[*Translation*]

This year, the Markham Thunder women's hockey team won the Clarkson Cup.

[*English*]

It is my honour, and Minister Jane Philpott's honour, to invite them to Ottawa today to meet the Prime Minister.

The Speaker: The hon. member is not to use the names of members in the House.

Ms. Mary Ng: It is my honour and that of Jane Philpott—

The Speaker: I must again remind the member not to use names of members. Perhaps she could adjust her statement as she finishes it to ensure that no further names are included.

Ms. Mary Ng: It is my honour to invite them to Ottawa today to meet the Prime Minister.

In 2007, the Canadian Women's Hockey League was created to be a space for women at the highest level of the sport to compete, as well as a commitment to the future of women's hockey in our country.

This team represents the best of women's hockey: the spirit, the tenacity, and the heart to never give up on one's dreams, no matter who says someone is too big or is just a girl.

I am proud to welcome the Clarkson Cup champions to our nation's capital.

* * *

74TH ANNIVERSARY OF D-DAY

Hon. Peter Van Loan (York—Simcoe, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this Wednesday, June 6th, marks the 74th anniversary of D-Day, the allied invasion of Normandy, commencing the liberation of Europe during World War II. Canada played a large role in the planning and execution of Operation Overlord. Canadian soldiers were tasked with capturing Juno Beach.

Those who were liberated appreciated the sacrifices that so many Canadians made. An example is located right on Juno Beach. The first building in Europe liberated during the invasion of Normandy overlooks the beach on which hundreds of Canadians died. The iconic house, seen in so many photos of D-Day, is known as "Maison des Canadiens".

Today the house is owned by the family of Hervé Hoffer. After meeting visiting Canadian veterans in 1984, Hoffer decided to honour the sacrifices made by decorating his house with photographs, flags, and other artifacts. Visitors are welcomed inside the house with gratitude and hospitality. Though Hoffer died in January 2017, we must ensure that the house, one of the most important buildings in Canadian military history, remains open to those who wish to visit and remember the sacrifices made by Canadian soldiers 74 years ago.

* * *

NATIONAL INDIGENOUS HISTORY MONTH

Mr. Michael McLeod (Northwest Territories, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to invite members of the House, and all Canadians, to join me in celebrating National Indigenous History Month, beginning June 1st. This is a great opportunity to learn about the culture, traditions, and contributions of first nations, Inuit, and Métis in Canada.

National Indigenous History Month marks a time to recognize the rich heritage and diversity of indigenous peoples, and promote respect, understanding, and appreciation. On June 21, people should be sure to share in the celebration of National Indigenous Peoples Day by participating in an event held in their area. I encourage everyone to take part in the variety of unique events that will be taking place all month long.

Mr. Speaker, *mahsi cho*.

* * *

[*Translation*]

ITALIAN HERITAGE MONTH

Mr. Angelo Iacono (Alfred-Pellan, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, June is Italian Heritage Month, an opportunity to celebrate the artistic, culinary, cultural, and musical contributions of our fellow citizens of Italian descent.

This recognition of our deep connection with our roots and our traditions reflects the pride and accomplishments of a strong, united community. The harmonious fusion of cultures where pasta and pizza are standard fare in Canadian homes and poutine and smoked meat are a must in Italian weddings is a testament to the beauty of our diversity.

In that spirit, members from all parties will gather tomorrow for the third annual Canada Italy Day on the Hill to celebrate all things Italian.

[*Member spoke in Italian as follows:*]

Viva l'Italia e grazie Canada per la vostra amicizia and [that's] amore.

* * *

● (1410)

M.G. L'HEUREUX FARM

Hon. Steven Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis, CPC): Mr. Speaker, World Milk Day is a UN initiative celebrated in early July recognizing the benefits of this white gold.

Like farms owned by many Canadian families, the M. G. L'Heureux farm in Saint-Henri, Bellechasse, proudly produces high-quality milk. The farm has been family-owned for 90 years, and since 1986 has been run by brothers Michel and Gilles and their spouses Raymonde and Nancy. The farm has experienced such growth that it is now the top dairy operation in eastern Quebec.

In addition to managing a herd of 580 dairy cows producing 8 million tonnes of milk a year, the family cultivates 2,700 acres of forage and cereal crops. This farm is known not only for its volume of production and use of advanced technology, but also for its Quebec and Latin American workers, as well as the successful efforts to transition ownership to the next generation.

The L'Heureux family was recently awarded the Grande Distinction Desjardins. On this World Milk Day, we thank and congratulate this family for their passion and commitment to sustainable prosperity.

* * *

[*English*]

PRIDE SEASON

Mr. Randy Boissonnault (Edmonton Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as the special adviser to the Prime Minister on LGBTQ2 issues, it is a singular honour to rise in the House today to celebrate the beginning of pride season.

[*Translation*]

Whether we live in Steinbach, Gaspé, Kelowna, St. John's, Jasper, Kincardine, Regina, Moncton, or Yellowknife, we are all called to be true to ourselves and to love whomever we want to love. While celebrating, we must remain vigilant, continue to make progress, and fight homophobia, transphobia, and biphobia.

[*English*]

For trans persons, homeless queer youth, re-closeted seniors, queer people of colour, and for two-spirit Canadians, LGBTQ2 rights are human rights. Human rights have no borders and they apply to all people.

This summer, the pride flag calls upon us to not rest until we have served all the peoples. Let us all, in this place, work together so that everyone in Canada and around the world can say, "I am free to be me; *je suis libre d'être moi -même*."

* * *

THOMAS "DUBBY" DUVALL

Mr. Scott Duvall (Hamilton Mountain, NDP): Mr. Speaker, on May 5th, I had the honour of taking part in a ceremony marking the induction of an incredible man into the Cambridge Sports Hall of Fame, Thomas J. "Dubby" Duvall. Not only was Dubby a well-known athlete, coach, and league organizer, he was also my great uncle.

The stories of Dubby's contribution to sports in Cambridge are legendary. He was a hockey player, a baseball player, and a professional wrestler. He was a respected hockey coach, with one of his teams capturing the Ontario Hockey Association championship.

Dubby also contributed endless hours helping to organize sports in Cambridge and across Ontario. From 1954 to 1956, he served as president of the Ontario Rural Softball Association and the Ontario rural hockey association, the only person in Ontario to hold both offices at the same time.

One of 18 children born in Thorold, Ontario, Dubby died in 1973, much too young, at the age of 67. It was a great privilege to join Dubby's son and my cousin George, and his wife Susan, to pay tribute to a man who was truly one of a kind and a great Canadian.

* * *

JUSTICE

Mr. Glen Motz (Medicine Hat—Cardston—Warner, CPC): Mr. Speaker, with their criminal justice reforms, the Liberals are making a bad situation worse. Under Bill C-75, the Liberals have created the option to proceed with a large number of violent offences by way of summary conviction rather than indictable offence. This means that violent criminals may receive no more than six months in jail or a fine for their crimes. These are six months for terrorist activities, obstructing justice, assault with a weapon, forced marriage, abduction, advocating genocide, participation in a criminal organization, or trafficking, just to name a few. These are serious offences. Putting these criminals back on the streets makes things even worse, and makes less sense.

This is another hurdle that the police have to protecting our streets, another barrier for parents protecting their children, another barrier to removing criminals and organized crime from our communities, and another example of the Liberals being soft on criminals and ignoring victims. I call on the government to admit its error and withdraw this bill.

● (1415)

NATIONAL CANADA SURVIVORS DAY

Mr. Richard Hébert (Lac-Saint-Jean, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, National Cancer Survivors Day is celebrated on the first Sunday of June each year. The day is meant to demonstrate that life after a cancer diagnosis can be a reality.

[*Translation*]

Our government understands the impact that a cancer diagnosis can have on families and their loved ones. That is why we invest nearly $50 million a year so that we can continue to support organizations such as the Canadian Partnership Against Cancer. The partnership has had a significant impact on the lives of Canadians through its work on prevention, early detection, treatment, and support for cancer patients.

Through the new historic investments set out in budget 2018, our government is ensuring that our researchers are well equipped to pursue their innovative work. I know that our government's measures are helping to ensure that more people are surviving cancer every day.

ORAL QUESTIONS

[*Translation*]

NATURAL RESOURCES

Hon. Andrew Scheer (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, last week, because of another failure of the Prime Minister, Canadians involuntarily became shareholders in the Trans Mountain pipeline.

As if the initial expenditure of $4.5 billion was not enough, we now know that some of that money was used to give very generous bonuses of over $1 billion to Kinder Morgan executives.

Can the Prime Minister tell us whether he knew that Canadians' money was going to be used like that? Why does he think that is acceptable?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are making investments to protect thousands of jobs in Alberta and across the country.

When I went to Fort McMurray to meet with energy sector workers, I told them that the government has their backs. From the beginning, this government has supported the thousands of energy sector workers across the country, and we will continue to work to protect Canadian jobs. We cannot comment on internal decisions that are part of private negotiations.

[*English*]

Hon. Andrew Scheer (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister has killed thousands of jobs in the energy sector by killing northern gateway and cancelling energy east. Last week, he announced that he is forcing Canadians to pay $4.5 billion for his failure to get Trans Mountain built. It is bad enough that the Prime Minister is sending taxpayers' money to Texas to be invested in American projects, but now we learn that he is paying two executives over $3 million in bonuses. Why is it that every time the Prime Minister bails out a big company, executives get paid off?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, for 10 years, the Conservatives tried and failed to get our oil resources to markets other than the United States. They could not get it done. We have actually moved forward in securing a pipeline to new markets across the Pacific, something they were unable to do. Yes, I know it is a shock to the Conservatives, but public investment has often been part of developing our natural resources, going back decades. They, however, are trapped in their ideology and continue to play politics with thousands of good jobs for Alberta.

* * *

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Hon. Andrew Scheer (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, last week, Conservatives supported the government in opposition to unacceptable tariffs levied against Canadian steel and aluminum workers. We supported the government's efforts to retaliate against this unilateral decision by the United States. However, while the U.S. tariffs came into force immediately, last Thursday, Canadian tariffs will not come into effect until July 1. Why?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I have said from the very beginning, it is one of Canada's strengths that on an issue as important as dealing with the Canada-U.S. relationship, Canadians have been broadly united, and I know that has made a difference in our ability to engage firmly and strongly with the United States.

On the question of the tariffs, we think it is important that before we bring in tariffs, we consult with Canadians to make sure that we are doing the right things for Canadians. We know these American motions are going to hurt workers in the United States. We would not want our decisions to hurt workers in Canada.

● (1420)

Hon. Andrew Scheer (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the workers in Canada are being affected right away. The effect on jobs and the Canadian economy is happening in real time. The American tariffs went into effect immediately, and Canadian shipments of steel are already being turned back from the border. Why is the Prime Minister waiting three weeks to impose these counter-measures, specifically on steel and aluminum, when the U.S. tariffs came into effect right away?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, one of the fundamental realities is that nobody wins in trade wars. We are continuing to impress upon our American partners and American citizens to understand that we do not want to harm jobs in the United States. We do not want to see job losses in Canada. We continue to believe that by working thoughtfully and firmly with the American administration, we are going to be able to move forward in a positive direction. That is what we are continuing to do. In the meantime, we will consult with Canadians on this important retaliatory measure.

* * *

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Hon. Andrew Scheer (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Iran's supreme leader, Ali Khamenei, tweeted that Israel "is a malignant cancerous tumor in the West Asian region that has to be removed and eradicated". This is nothing less than an incitement to genocide, and Conservatives condemn it in the strongest possible language. The Iranian regime is a state sponsor of terror that supports Hamas. This is another reason why it is important for Canada to stand with Israel when it comes under attack, but this also highlights the fact that Canada cannot tolerate this hatred. Will the Prime Minister commit now to ending all efforts to normalize relations with Iran?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the position of Iran is unacceptable, and our position on Iran is clear: We oppose Iran's support for terrorist organizations, its threats toward Israel, its ballistic missile program, and its support for the Assad regime.

Canada is a steadfast friend of Israel and a friend to the Palestinian people. We are committed to the goal of a comprehensive, just, and lasting peace in the Middle East, including the creation of a Palestinian state living side by side in peace and security with Israel. We continue to support the building of conditions necessary for both parties to find a solution.

* * *

[*Translation*]

NATURAL RESOURCES

Ms. Ruth Ellen Brosseau (Berthier—Maskinongé, NDP): Mr. Speaker, a couple of Kinder Morgan executives must be laughing today.

The two top executives responsible for the Trans Mountain expansion each pocketed $1.5 million in bonuses. That adds up to $3 million in bonuses alone. That is absolutely ridiculous.

Even now, the Prime Minister is breaking his promise to end oil industry subsidies and helping the rich get richer. Great job.

Does the Prime Minister think it is okay—

The Speaker: Order. I must remind members to always address their remarks to the Chair.

The right hon. Prime Minister.

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are currently losing $15 billion per year because we cannot export our oil resources to countries other than the United States.

One thing that has become crystal clear in recent days is how important access to new markets is. To that end, we need reliable, responsible access, which we can achieve with the pipeline we approved in accordance with a system that included more consultation with indigenous peoples. We will continue to make investments that are in the national interest, and that is what we are doing.

* * *

INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS

Ms. Ruth Ellen Brosseau (Berthier—Maskinongé, NDP): Mr. Speaker, for a government that claims that no relationship is as important as its relationship with indigenous peoples, I suspect it might be embarrassing to purchase a pipeline and force it on the people despite strong and growing opposition from indigenous communities. In fact, it should be ashamed.

Does the government think that imposing this pipeline expansion at all costs after a botched, flawed process really respects the Constitution and honours the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we fully support the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. We will continue to work in partnership with them.

On this side of the House, we will listen to all indigenous voices. We will not ignore those who stay silent or who say things we do not want to hear. It would be nice if all parties of the House could see both sides of the issue. We are listening to people who adamantly oppose pipelines, as well as those who see the economic benefit for them and their communities. That is what Canadians expect of us.

● (1425)

[*English*]

Ms. Georgina Jolibois (Desnethé—Missinippi—Churchill River, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am shocked that today the government has chosen to completely disregard its obligations under the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. Last week, the Prime Minister voted in favour of developing a recognition and implementation of rights framework in partnership with indigenous peoples, and five days later he has failed his first test.

Does the Prime Minister understand that respecting the rights of first nations, Métis, and Inuit peoples means respecting even those who do not agree with him? The Prime Minister cannot tell me that I do not understand.

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I respectfully suggest that, indeed, during consultations, listening and working to build reconciliation with indigenous peoples means listening to all voices of the indigenous community, including those who disagree with us. We have a tremendous depth of respect for all indigenous voices, both from those who oppose the pipeline and from those who wish the pipeline to move forward. Working with them to allay fears and create opportunities is something all Canadians expect of our government on the path to reconciliation.

NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. Nathan Cullen (Skeena—Bulkley Valley, NDP): Mr. Speaker, Canadians were stunned to watch this climate-fighting Prime Minister promise to end fossil fuel subsidies and then go out and buy himself a used pipeline, a 65-year-old pipeline, with our money. These geniuses paid eight times the price that it was bought for just a few years ago. Adding insult to injury in this public bailout, it includes a $3-million bonus to Kinder Morgan executives. "Sorry, not sorry" is not going to cut it this time.

Will the Liberals come clean and table the deal on the Kinder Morgan bailout so all Canadians can see how they ripped us off?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, $15 billion a year is what it costs us when we cannot export our oil resources to markets other than the United States. The Conservatives, who pretended they were great friends of the oil industry, were not able to achieve that in 10 years of trying, and we are now able to secure a pipeline that gets our oil resources to new markets. On top of that, it goes within a pan-Canadian framework on climate change, which includes a national price on carbon pollution right across the country and a historic oceans protection plan.

* * *

[*Translation*]

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Mr. Luc Berthold (Mégantic—L'Érable, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Canadian farmers are dealing with a two-faced Liberal government that claims here in the House to be protecting supply management, while it negotiates supply management market share with the Americans behind closed doors. That is exactly what the Prime Minister admitted in an interview on NBC: Canada will be flexible on access to the agricultural market to ease negotiations on NAFTA. How hypocritical.

I am calling for an honest answer. Have the Liberals proposed an agreement to the Americans that would sacrifice market share in supply management, yes or no?

[*English*]

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I have said many times in the House, our government strongly supports and is committed to the supply management system in this country. I myself, as well as the Prime Minister, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, cabinet ministers and caucus, and, indeed, the trade negotiators of NAFTA, have clearly indicated the Canadian direction.

The Liberal government is the government that put supply management in place, and it is the Liberal government that will protect supply management.

AGRICULTURE AND AGRI-FOOD

Mr. John Barlow (Foothills, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberal attack on agriculture is devastating: front-of-pack labelling, food guide, grain backlog, bungled trade agreements, and tax hikes. Now the agriculture minister is claiming that farmers support the Liberal carbon tax. Has he even spoken to Canadian farmers?

The chair of the Western Canadian Wheat Growers Association said, "I'm not sure who has been briefing [the minister], but he is dead wrong if he thinks that most farmers support a carbon tax".

How can the minister speak for agriculture if he is so out of touch with Canadian farmers?

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my hon. colleague is well aware that Canadian farmers are great stewards of the land who know the importance of protecting the environment, and they are making vital contributions to fighting climate change.

We know that farmers had some concerns, and that is why gasoline and diesel fuel for on-farm use are exempt under the federal backstop. Unlike the previous Conservative government, we have invested in agriculture research and science. In fact, it was the Conservative government that cut—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

● (1430)

The Speaker: The hon. opposition House leader.

Hon. Candice Bergen (Portage—Lisgar, CPC): Mr. Speaker, let me be clear. Canadian farmers do not support a carbon tax. The ag minister is clearly dead wrong on that. In fact, the Western Canadian Wheat Growers said that the carbon tax is bad for farmers. It is going to put them at a huge disadvantage on the world stage.

Will the ag minister finally admit that the carbon tax is bad for farm families, and maybe while he is at it, tell those families how much the carbon tax is going to cost them?

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I know my hon. colleague is well aware and understands that farmers are great stewards of the land. They understand how important it is to take care of our environment. Farmers have great concerns, and that is why diesel fuel and gasoline are exempt under our federal backstop.

Through the federal government's investments, we are continuing to build a strong economy for our farmers while putting environmental protections in place. What we have done, as I indicated, is put more money into research and science in agriculture, which is vitally important.

* * *

TAXATION

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Carleton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Canadian workers are under attack, with Trump tariffs from abroad and Liberal taxes here at home, higher taxes on middle-class Canadians and higher taxes on the businesses that employ them. Ironically, the same companies south of the border that are pushing for this protectionism will also benefit from the carbon tax here in Canada, which would drive money, jobs, and income into that country.

How much will the carbon tax cost the average Canadian steel and aluminum worker?

Mr. Jonathan Wilkinson (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canadians know that we can fight climate change and grow our economy at the same time. That is what our plan is doing, and it is working. Canada's emissions are dropping, while the economy grows. In the past two years, there have been 600,000 new jobs. The unemployment rate is at the lowest level in decades. Since 2016, Canada has led other G7 countries in economic growth.

Putting a price on pollution will make Canada's economy stronger over time. It will create good economic progress. It will create good middle-class jobs. It will do the right thing for our children and for the future of the planet.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Carleton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, everybody knows that Donald Trump wants to take our money and our jobs. What we cannot understand is why the Government of Canada is helping him.

Higher taxes here at home make it very difficult for Canadian businesses to compete south of the border. In fact, Canadian investment in the United States is up two-thirds since the current Prime Minister took office, and American investment in Canada is down by half. Money is going that way, and jobs will soon follow.

How much will this carbon tax cost the average Canadian worker?

Mr. Jonathan Wilkinson (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is very evident that the Conservatives do not have a plan to address climate change. They are missing the boat on the future economic opportunities enabled by addressing climate change in a thoughtful and substantive way. According to the World Bank, the Paris Agreement will open up $23 trillion in opportunities. We are focused on ensuring that we are driving clean technology, that we are moving forward with an agenda that will address environmental imperatives, and that we do so in a way that will create a stronger economy for Canada in years to come.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Carleton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals are saying they are trying to put a price on something. What they are doing is putting a price on hiring Canadian workers. Those same workers will bring with them higher payroll taxes, and now higher carbon taxes, taxes that those companies will not have to pay south of the border. While the Government of Canada is now sending $4.5 billion to a Texas company to build pipelines in a jurisdiction that competes with Canada, it is raising taxes here at home to drive jobs outside of our country.

How much will this carbon tax cost the average Canadian worker?

Mr. Jonathan Wilkinson (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canadians know that climate change is real. They expect us to take strong action to address climate change, and that is exactly what we are doing. We have taken action through the pan-Canadian framework on clean growth and climate change to accelerate the phase-out of coal, to put methane regulations in place, to promote green infrastructure, and to do a whole range of things that will allow us to stimulate the economy, grow the economy of the future, and fundamentally address the critical issue of climate change going forward.

Unfortunately, the opposition members are making this a partisan issue. Climate change is something that is in the interest of every Canadian and every human being on this planet, and is something that they should not play—

● (1435)

The Speaker: The hon. member for Jonquière.

* * *

[*Translation*]

THE ECONOMY

Ms. Karine Trudel (Jonquière, NDP): Mr. Speaker, Canadian steel and aluminum workers are facing considerable uncertainty. The decision to hit our industries with these punitive tariffs is completely scandalous. The Trump administration has gone too far, and the Canadian steel and aluminum industries are going to pay the price.

We are glad that the government is meeting with industry to discuss a solution, but it has to meet the needs of the workers. That is important.

Will the Prime Minister put in place a support program to protect workers, like Quebec is preparing to do?

Hon. Navdeep Bains (Minister of Innovation, Science and Economic Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our government will continue to support and defend Canadian workers and producers. That is our government's priority.

[*English*]

That is why we are very proud of our world-class producers. That is why we completely agree with the members opposite that it is absolutely unacceptable that these tariffs were imposed. That is why we will defend them and are engaging with them to see what the next steps and options are.

Make no mistake: our government will continue to support aluminum workers and steelworkers across Canada.

Ms. Tracey Ramsey (Essex, NDP): Mr. Speaker, we are four days into the U.S. unfair steel and aluminum tariffs, and Canadian workers in the manufacturing sector spent the weekend worried about their jobs. Canadians are asking why the government was waiting 30 days to bring in our own tariffs. These tariffs are a Band-Aid solution, and the government must work toward a permanent exemption. The clock is already ticking on a similar decision on tariffs to our auto sector. Hundreds of thousands of jobs are literally on the line. How is the government going to ensure Canadian workers in our largest industries are protected against destructive tactics from south of the border?

Hon. Andrew Leslie (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs (Canada-U.S. Relations), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let me be clear. These tariffs are completely unacceptable. Our government will and has taken responsive measures to defend Canada's interests after consulting with Canadians to make sure that no Canadians are adversely impacted on the detailed target list that we promulgated on our websites. These tariffs are not acceptable. They will harm U.S. workers and their industry, as well as Canadians. In fact, the U.S. has a surplus in trade with Canada vis-à-vis steel. Canada is also a safe and secure supplier of fairly traded steel and aluminum to the U.S. Members can rest assured that Canadian workers can absolutely count—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Lakeland.

* * *

NATURAL RESOURCES

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs (Lakeland, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals paid $4.5 billion in Canadian tax dollars to purchase the existing Trans Mountain pipeline, while Kinder Morgan is taking $7.4 billion of private investment planned for its expansion out of Canada. Apparently the gift of tax dollars will also pay $1.5-million bonuses each to two Kinder Morgan executives, which is good news for the rich executives and bad news for Canadian energy workers.

Why is the Prime Minister paying mega-bonuses to millionaires with taxpayer dollars while middle-class Canadians in the same industry struggle to find work?

Hon. Bill Morneau (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we would like to focus on the good news for Canadians. The good news is that we found a way to make sure that we can complete a pipeline that will allow us to get to international markets, creating enormous value of up to $15 billion a year for the industry, but, most importantly, creating thousands of jobs across our country, jobs in British Columbia and jobs in Alberta and jobs across the country.

We are going to stand up for those workers and we are going to stand up for the Canadian economy for future workers.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs (Lakeland, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Kinder Morgan did not actually need one cent of taxpayer money. The Liberals just had to enforce federal jurisdiction, which they did promise to legislate, but they nationalized the old pipeline instead. It is a bad signal for future private sector investment in pipelines and Canadian oil and gas.

Since 2015, the Liberals have jeopardized Canada's energy sector, killed hundreds of billions of dollars in major energy projects, and sacrificed hundreds of thousands of jobs. Why is the Prime Minister giving money to rich millionaires while families in the energy sector are struggling to make ends meet because of him?

Hon. Bill Morneau (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, for those families who are relying on a strong energy sector, we are doing exactly what we should do: a project in the national interest that will secure the industry and at the same time create thousands of new jobs. For Alberta workers, for British Columbia workers, I am so pleased we have Liberal members who are supporting what we are doing on behalf of those workers, and I am disappointed that the members across the way are not supporting those workers.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gérard Deltell (Louis-Saint-Laurent, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Canadian families are outraged over the Canadian government's handling of the Trans Mountain project. The Liberals have decided to nationalize a pipeline, resulting in $4.5 billion in taxpayers' money leaving Canada and going directly to Texans' pockets.

What we did not know was that two of the company's executives received a generous $1.5-million bonus each.

Can the Prime Minister tell us with a straight face that he thinks it is a smart move to take Canadians' money and give it to U.S. corporate executives?

● (1440)

Hon. Bill Morneau (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we know that it is very important to Canada's economy to invest in the pipeline in order to reach international markets. It is also very important for families, because of the number of associated jobs across the country. At the same time, we can boost our economy because this represents approximately $15 billion a year for our resource sector. It is very important and we will do it.

Mr. Gérard Deltell (Louis-Saint-Laurent, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Canadians are in favour of Trans Mountain. They want the project to move forward, but they do not want their money to be used to make Americans richer. The government is sending $4.5 billion straight to Texas, not to mention all the executive bonuses. Come on. This makes no sense.

Why does the government keep pushing this? It could have done something in the past year and a half, but it did nothing, and now the pipeline is being nationalized.

Does the minister truly think it is a good idea to take $4.5 billion of taxpayer money and send it to Texas?

Hon. Bill Morneau (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, working for Canadians is what is important to us. The economy is also very important.

Thanks to our investment, we will have a pipeline to access international markets. This is very important, and it is why we made the decision. We would also like to create a better economy for the future and maintain good jobs in Alberta and British Columbia.

CANADIAN HERITAGE

Mr. Pierre Nantel (Longueuil—Saint-Hubert, NDP): Mr. Speaker, last week, the CRTC submitted its report, which proposes solutions for the future of our culture. It describes the current system as untenable. The cultural community said that it had finally been heard and that it hoped that the government would do something.

The government has been talking about this for three years and meanwhile, every day, Canadians are turning to new media with no Canadian content and no taxes. This is not the wild west.

Will the minister of culture commit to announcing, in the coming days, the main thrusts of a reform, rather than a new one-year consultation process?

Mr. Sean Casey (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, first, we would like to thank the chair of the CRTC, Ian Scott, and his team for their report, as well as all of the businesses and stakeholders who contributed to it.

Our objective is to modernize our laws to protect and promote our 21st century culture. We will soon have news regarding the review of our laws. Unlike Mr. Harper's Conservatives, who made draconian cuts and waged a war against the cultural sector, we are taking action to help this sector and our artists.

[*English*]

Ms. Rachel Blaney (North Island—Powell River, NDP): Mr. Speaker, last week, the CRTC submitted its report to the heritage minister, indicating that urgent reforms are needed to sustain Canadian culture in television, film, and music and that the current system is simply unsustainable. It is critical that large corporations and web giants chip in their fair share to preserve Canadian content on our screens. We do not need another study or yet another consultation; we need action now.

Will the Liberal government stop dragging its feet and commit to reforms today?

Mr. Sean Casey (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, first we would like to thank CRTC chair Ian Scott and his team for the report, and thank the many companies and creative industry players who contributed to it.

Ultimately, our objective will be to modernize our laws for the 21st century in order to protect and promote our culture. We will have more to say on a review of the Broadcasting Act and the Telecommunications Act very shortly. Unlike the Harper Conservatives, who ignored these issues and did nothing but cut funding to culture for a decade, we are taking action and delivering for creators and Canadians.

Oral Questions

HEALTH

Mr. John Oliver (Oakville, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, cannabis consumption rates by our youth are among the highest in the developed world. Education aimed at teenagers about the dangers of cannabis use is essential. As a hockey dad, I have taken my son William to many Oakville Blades hockey games. I know how influential professional hockey players can be as role models, so I am excited about our government's recent partnership to educate teenagers about the risk of cannabis.

Can the Minister of Health please update the House on her public awareness campaign?

● (1445)

Hon. Ginette Petitpas Taylor (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague from Oakville for his hard work on the health committee.

As mentioned, the Harper Conservatives' approach to cannabis did not work and does not work. It has allowed criminals and organized crime to profit while it has failed to keep it out of the hands of our youth. However, since forming government, we have taken a public health approach, one that maximizes education and minimizes the harm. Last week, I was extremely pleased to announce that we are partnering with the Canadian Hockey League to allow youth to hear from players about how making healthy choices can help them achieve their life goals.

* * *

[*Translation*]

IMMIGRATION, REFUGEES AND CITIZENSHIP

Mr. Pierre Paul-Hus (Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles, CPC): Mr. Speaker, over 20,000 people entered Canada illegally in 2017. The figure so far for 2018 is already in excess of 8,000. The safe third country agreement has been in place since 2004, but it is no longer appropriate for the reality on the ground. On the contrary, it is encouraging mass illegal immigration at our borders.

The Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship has talked about renegotiating the agreement, but no concrete action has been taken, apart from a partial reimbursement to the Quebec government. The Prime Minister needs to show leadership on this issue and come up with concrete solutions for protecting our borders.

When are we going to see a plan?

Mr. Serge Cormier (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our government is acutely aware that irregular migrants place new pressures on certain provinces, that need to find temporary accommodations for these asylum seekers.

Since my colleague mentioned funding, I am pleased to announce that we have invested $50 million in Quebec, Ontario, and Manitoba, the three provinces most affected by accommodation costs. We recognize that these provinces and the municipalities have worked hard to provide housing and other services. We commend them on their outstanding collaboration. We are going to keep working very hard to address this issue with the provinces on the task force.

Mr. Pierre Paul-Hus (Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles, CPC): Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned earlier, this was a small reimbursement that was clearly welcomed by Quebec. However, the Prime Minister accuses us of sowing fear and division whenever we remind him of his responsibility to enforce our border and immigration laws.

Meanwhile, 800 employees from all over Canada have been reassigned to Quebec, the biometric collection system for asylum seekers has broken down, security screening interviews have been cut down from eight hours to two, and just 135 of the more than 30,000 people who have entered Canada illegally have been deported. This is not about fear. It is about enforcing Canada's sovereignty.

Where is the plan?

[*English*]

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the security agencies of the country, particularly CBSA, have made the appropriate arrangements internally to make sure they have the resources and facilities at the border to deal with all circumstances, usual and unusual. In the last budget, the Minister of Finance made $173 million available to the various agencies dealing with this—the CBSA, the RCMP, and the immigration and refugees department—to make sure that we can enforce all Canadian laws and honour all Canadian international obligations.

* * *

SPORT

Ms. Rachael Harder (Lethbridge, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Bertrand Charest, a former national ski coach, was convicted in 2017 of sexually assaulting a number of his athletes.

Four courageous women who suffered due to his negligent actions, or criminal actions, we would call them, are requesting all sport federations to implement athlete safety programs. They are calling for the universal adoption of the "rule of two" to ensure that no young athlete is left alone with his or her coach.

In response to these courageous women, what actions will the Minister of Sport commit to taking to stand up for young athletes in Canada?

Hon. Kirsty Duncan (Minister of Science and Minister of Sport and Persons with Disabilities, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there is no tolerance of harassment of any kind. All Canadians deserve the opportunity to participate in a sport environment that is free from discrimination, harassment, and abuse.

We have established a working group on gender equity in sport, which will examine a number of issues, including harassment, discrimination, and abuse in sport. All federally funded sport organizations must have anti-discrimination, harassment, and abuse policies in place to be eligible for funding. We will be announcing changes to strengthen our policy in the coming weeks.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Stephanie Kusie (Calgary Midnapore, CPC): Madam Speaker, today, four victims of former national ski coach Bertrand Charest spoke publicly about their abuse. My thoughts are with Geneviève Simard, Anna Prchal, Gail Kelly, and Amélie-Frédérique Gagnon, who are only asking that young athletes be protected.

What is the minister going to do?

● (1450)

Hon. Kirsty Duncan (Minister of Science and Minister of Sport and Persons with Disabilities, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for her question.

[*English*]

As I have said, there is no tolerance of harassment of any kind. We have established a working group on gender equity in sport, which will examine a number of issues, including harassment in sport. All federally funded sport organizations must have an anti-discrimination, harassment, and abuse policy in place to be eligible for funding. We will be announcing changes to strengthen that policy in the coming weeks.

* * *

VETERANS AFFAIRS

Mr. Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Mr. Speaker, while new dedicated funds to research post-traumatic stress injury disorder is welcome, research is just one element in this crucial fight.

We cannot have a conversation about PTSD without a conversation about treatment. Many were hoping that dedicated resources for treatment facilities would also be announced. We know that a lack of PTSD treatment is a significant contributing factor to the recent deaths by suicide of our veterans.

Will the government work with us and veterans to make sure that necessary treatment is widely available?

Hon. Seamus O'Regan (Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there is no question that one suicide is one too many.

I am continuing to work with the Minister of National Defence on this as a priority of our government. To this end, we have hired 460 new front-line staff, and 4,000 mental health professionals that we work with. We have opened 11 operational stress injury clinics that deal with PTSD. We announced the opening of a new centre of excellence on PTSD just recently. In fact our newly proposed pension for life is centred around the flexibility required for the treatment of PTSD.

* * *

[*Translation*]

EMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Ms. Brigitte Sansoucy (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, NDP): Mr. Speaker, for several years, the Liberals have been proudly saying to anyone who will listen that the EI gap is fixed.

Oddly enough, seasonal workers in the Atlantic provinces have a completely different experience. The training program does not fix the EI gap. In a few months, their nightmare will begin anew. Putting money into half measures is not enough. Seasonal workers want EI reform, as promised.

When will this reform happen?

Hon. Jean-Yves Duclos (Minister of Families, Children and Social Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, all members in the House know just how important the EI system is to providing income security and job transition opportunities to all families and workers, and in particular seasonal workers.

We have listened to our provincial and territorial partners, and in recent weeks and months we implemented important measures to provide appropriate support in the coming months and years. This support will provide hope and opportunities to all of our communities, workers, and businesses.

* * *

[*English*]

DEMOCRATIC REFORM

Mr. Blake Richards (Banff—Airdrie, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Canadians are concerned about foreign interference in elections through third party spending, and rightfully so.

Right now in the Ontario election, Leadnow, a shadowy, foreign-funded group, is paying thousands of dollars to try to affect the outcome of that election. This is a problem federally, too. The Liberals are allowing foreign groups to flow unlimited amounts of money to influence Canadian elections through third parties.

Will the Liberals actually protect our elections from foreign influence, or perhaps they are trying to benefit from it?

Hon. Karina Gould (Minister of Democratic Institutions, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my colleague opposite's assertion is absolutely false. We are doing everything we can to ensure that we do not have foreign funding within our elections here in Canada. In fact, it is already illegal for foreign entities or individuals to contribute to political parties or campaigns. We are ensuring that we are tightening loopholes with regard to third parties. Third parties, in the next election, should this legislation pass, would be required to open a bank account. They would be required to report all the time the contributions they receive, and they would have a limit on their spending during an election and during the pre-writ period.

Mr. Blake Richards (Banff—Airdrie, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am totally aghast that the Liberals are continually trying to sweep this problem under the rug. Is it that the Liberals know that they benefit from this shady third party foreign spending? I say this because under this new legislation, third parties would still be able to take unlimited amounts of foreign cash as long as they do so before June 30. That money will be directly used to influence the outcome of Canadian elections.

Can the minister explain how this is not just the Liberals acting in their own self-interest once again instead of protecting Canada's democracy from foreign interference?

Hon. Karina Gould (Minister of Democratic Institutions, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am absolutely aghast that the member opposite is fearmongering in this way. We take foreign influence in our elections extraordinarily seriously, including with regard to foreign funds, which is what we are doing in this legislation to ensure that it will be limited not just with the six months prior to an election as the previous Conservative government did, but also, in fact, requiring that third parties report all the time the funding they have, and open a bank account to assert that the only money used is Canadian. Furthermore, we are also taking actions with regard to the cybersphere and foreign influence. We are going to protect our next election.

* * *

● (1455)

[*Translation*]

PUBLIC SAFETY

Mr. Alupa Clarke (Beauport—Limoilou, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this Friday and Saturday, the people of Beauport—Limoilou will be in the thick of the G7 action, for good reasons or for bad, because we live between downtown Quebec and Charlevoix. An anti-G7 protest in Beauport, near the highway to La Malbaie, is already scheduled.

Residents and business owners are increasingly worried. Uncertainty prevails, especially about the compensation procedures; in truth, people are wondering if they will get any compensation at all.

In case of damage due to vandalism or demonstrations getting out of hand, will the residents and business owners of Beauport—Limoilou receive compensation?

Mr. Matt DeCourcey (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to start by assuring my colleague across the aisle that the compensation policies for affected businesses are the same as when Canada was hosting the G7 in 2010, when his party was in government. In addition, we actively collaborated with all regional partners, local communities, first nations, the Quebec government, and the City of Quebec. We also held a public meeting to gather feedback from local residents. This event will generate major economic benefits throughout the region.

* * *

PENSIONS

Mrs. Alexandra Mendès (Brossard—Saint-Lambert, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our government enhanced the Canada pension plan, restored the eligibility age for old age security and the guaranteed income supplement to 65, and implemented automatic registration for the GIS. That is how we are addressing the problems Canadian seniors are worried about.

Last week, the minister responsible for seniors met with the National Seniors Council.

Can the minister tell us about the council's mandate and how its work will help the government continue to meet seniors' needs?

Hon. Jean-Yves Duclos (Minister of Families, Children and Social Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by thanking my colleague from Brossard—Saint-Lambert for the amazing work she is doing to support our seniors.

The National Seniors Council is a major partner whose experience and expertise are vital to helping us provide quality services and benefits to all our seniors. That is why we are fortunate to be working with the council's new chairperson, Dr. Suzanne Dupuis-Blanchard, who has 25 years of experience in gerontology and community health and who will be helping us as we continue to work very hard for our seniors.

* * *

[*English*]

ETHICS

Mr. Todd Doherty (Cariboo—Prince George, CPC): Mr. Speaker, from the very beginning, the minister has prioritized his Liberal family and friends over the hard-working, good people of Grand Bank. He compromised a 25-year surf clam success story for partisan gain. In the words of the Fisheries Council of Canada, he has undermined Canada's fisheries sector. With all the controversy, it now appears the minister has been informed that Five Nations cannot even secure financing.

When will the minister admit he has created a disaster, start a new, fair, and open and transparent process, and recuse himself from the file?

Mr. Terry Beech (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Fisheries, Oceans and the Canadian Coast Guard, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I have risen to state in the House many times, many of these allegations are unsubstantiated. Our government believes that increasing indigenous participation in offshore fisheries offers a powerful opportunity to advance reconciliation. That is why we created a process that we are proud of to consult industry and indigenous communities on potential participation in the surf clam fishery.

This process was similar to the one undertaken by the previous Conservative government, except they forgot to include indigenous people. We did not forget. We are focused on how this is benefiting the highest number of Atlantic Canadians and first nations in Atlantic Canada and Quebec.

* * *

CANADA POST

Ms. Irene Mathyssen (London—Fanshawe, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the Canada Post retail outlet in Bentley, Alberta is closing and residents will be forced to travel more than 22 kilometres each way to access postal services. Not only is this absolutely unacceptable, but it is also a direct violation of Canada Post's own charter.

Canada Post has apologized for the inconvenience, but apologies just do not cut it. What will the government do to ensure that communities like Bentley have access to full postal services?

Hon. Carla Qualtrough (Minister of Public Services and Procurement, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our government has introduced a new vision for Canada Post that puts service front and centre and fulfills its platform commitments. Part of that vision includes reinvesting profits in Canada Post service and innovation.

We certainly encourage Canada Post to expand its partnerships for the benefit of Canadians. We have heard loud and clear from the Canada Post review that it should focus its efforts on excellence in service and its core functions, and we agree with this view.

* * *

● (1500)

INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS

Mr. Lloyd Longfield (Guelph, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, even today, there are indigenous children living on reserves in Canada who cannot safely drink, bathe in, or even play in the water that comes out of their taps. This is why we committed to ending long-term drinking water advisories on all public systems on reserves by March 2021. Could the hon. Minister of Indigenous Services please update the House as to the actions being taken to ensure reliable access to clean drinking water on reserves.

Hon. Jane Philpott (Minister of Indigenous Services, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his advocacy on this issue. I am happy to report to the House that as of today we have lifted 62 long-term drinking water advisories for public systems on reserves.

Canadians really care about this, and finally we have a government that has the political will, the long-term investments, and the meticulous organization to work with communities to make sure that water operators are trained. We will continue to do this work with communities and make sure that all long-term drinking water advisories for public systems—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis.

* * *

[*Translation*]

EMPLOYMENT

Hon. Steven Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we were shocked to discover on the Government of Canada website that Liberal ministers and MPs supposedly funded organizations in several ridings that support terrorist groups like Hamas and Hezbollah, which are associated with anti-Semitism and violent homophobia. The religious leader for one of these organizations was recently criticized for his appalling anti-Semitism.

Now that the Liberals have specifically introduced an attestation on respect for human rights, how can the Prime Minister justify the unjustifiable and unacceptable?

Hon. Patty Hajdu (Minister of Employment, Workforce Development and Labour, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our government doubled the funding for the Canada summer jobs program in order to offer nearly 70,000 students paid work experience.

[*English*]

All organizations approved for Canada summer jobs funding must adhere to the terms and conditions of the program. If an organization does not respect these terms and conditions, it will not be reimbursed for the salaries of the students it has hired.

I have asked my department to look into these organizations, and we will continue from there.

* * *

[*Translation*]

PUBLIC SAFETY

Mr. Rhéal Fortin (Rivière-du-Nord, GPQ): Mr. Speaker, we all know that G7 protests are inevitable, but we hope that they will be peaceful.

We also all know that vandalism could occur, but the government has not made any plans in that regard. The government expects residents and businesses to get their insurance to cover the cost of any damage. Canadians should not have to foot the bill for G7-related property damage. They should not have to pay deductibles or premium increases.

Will the government immediately commit to compensating any victims of G7-related vandalism?

Mr. Matt DeCourcey (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to reiterate what I just said about how proud we are to welcome world leaders to the beautiful Charlevoix region for the G7 summit this week.

The Prime Minister met with local leaders, first nations communities, and local residents to ensure that the meeting this weekend goes well. We know that residents of Charlevoix are proud to host this meeting. What is more, policies have been in place for a long time regarding compensation for local businesses related to this event.

Mr. Simon Marcil (Mirabel, GPQ): Mr. Speaker, Global Affairs Canada has told farmers not to spread manure during the G7. Once again, Ottawa does not understand the regions.

Here is how it works. Farmers have only until June 15 to finish planting their crops, but they have to spread manure before planting. These farms produce the food that the ministers from the big city will find on their expensive menus at the G7. That is what happens when events take place in rural areas. The scenery is beautiful, but people are hard at work.

Does the government realize that its directive is unrealistic?

Mr. Matt DeCourcey (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, once again, Canada will be hosting a world-class event this weekend when we welcome the world for the G7. We are proud, as is everyone in the Charlevoix region, to be hosting this important event. It is an opportunity to talk about issues that are important to the entire world, such as human rights, democracy, and peaceful pluralism, things that Canada strongly advocates for in the world.

● (1505)

[*English*]

INFRASTRUCTURE

Mr. Erin Weir (Regina—Lewvan, CCF): Mr. Speaker, with the U.S. imposing tariffs on steel, one way to offset lost exports is to ensure public infrastructure is built with Canadian steel. Last week I asked about Regina steel for Trans Mountain. Two years ago I asked why less than 20% of the steel in the new Champlain Bridge would be made in Canada.

In response to Trump's tariffs, will the government finally increase the amount of Canadian steel used in federal infrastructure projects?

Mr. Marc Miller (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Infrastructure and Communities, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member will recall that we are delivering a historic infrastructure plan of $180 billion over the next 10 years.

As part of our procurement process, the hon. member will note that we are a free trade country. We must respect our engagements to be open and free with the world, and that goes the same for our procurement process, which will remain open, transparent, and free, as part of a free trading nation.

The Speaker: It is my duty pursuant to Standing Order 38 to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis, Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship; the hon. member for Lethbridge, Rail Transportation; the hon. member for Oshawa, International Trade.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*Translation*]

BUDGET IMPLEMENTATION ACT, 2018, NO. 1

The House resumed from May 31 consideration of Bill C-74, an act to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on February 27, 2018 and other measures, as reported (with amendments) from the committee; and of the motions in Group No. 1.

The Speaker: It being 3:07 p.m., pursuant to order made on Tuesday, May 29, 2018, the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded divisions on the motions at report stage of Bill C-74.

Call in the members.

[*English*]

And the bells having rung:

The Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 1. The vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 2 to 46.

● (1515)

[*Translation*]

(The House divided on Motion No. 1, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 691)

YEAS

Members

Aboultaif
Allison
Barlow
Bergen
Berthold
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Calkins
Chong
Cooper
Doherty
Eglinski
Falk (Provencher)
Finley
Generoux
Gladu
Gourde
Jeneroux
Kent
Kmiec
Lake
Liepert
Lukiwski
McCauley (Edmonton West)
Motz
Nicholson
Obhrai
Poilievre
Reid
Saroya
Schmale
Shipley
Stanton
Stubbs
Tilson
Van Kesteren
Vecchio
Wagantall
Waugh
Wong

Albrecht
Anderson
Benson
Bernier
Bezan
Brassard
Carrie
Clarke
Dehell
Dreeshen
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Fast
Gallant
Genuis
Godin
Harder
Kelly
Kitchen
Kmiec
Lauzon (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Lobb
MacKenzie
Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound)
Nater
Nuttall
Paul-Hus
Rayes
Richards
Scheer
Shields
Sorenson
Strahl
Sweet
Trost
Van Loan
Viersen
Warkentin
Webber
Yurdiga — 78

NAYS

Members

Abbig
Allesley
Arseneault
Aubin
Badawey
Bains
Baylis
Beech
Benson
Bittle
Blair
Boissonnault
Boudrias
Boutin-Sweet
Breton
Caesar-Chavannes
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Chagger
Choquette
Cullen
Dabrusin
Davies
Dhaliwal
Drouin
Dubourg
Duguid
Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)
Dzerowicz
El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith
Eyolfson
Finnigan
Fonseca
Fortin

Alghabra
Amos
Arya
Ayoub
Bagnell
Barsalou-Duval
Beaudin
Bennett
Bibeau
Blaikie
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Bossio
Boudrias
Bratina
Brosseau
Cannings
Casey (Charlottetown)
Chen
Cormier
Currie
Damoff
DeCourcey
Dhillon
Dubé
Duclos
Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Duvall
Ehsassi
Ellis
Eyking
Fillmore
Fisher
Fortier
Fragiskatos

Fraser (West Nova)
Fry
Garneau
Gerretsen
Gockhanth Jones
Gould
Hardcastle
Hébert
Hogg
Hughes
Iacono
Ashton
Jordan
Khalid
Laudrupeaks
Lamoureux
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite Nation)
Lebouthillier
Leslie
Lightbound
Long
Ludwig
MacGregor
Malcolmson
Marcil
Mathyssen
May (Nanaimo—Gulf Islands)
McDonald
McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Mendès
Mihychuk
Socinzi
Monsef
Morneau
Murray
Nassif
Ng
O'Regan
Paradis
Peschisolido
Philpott
Poissant
Ramsey
Rotami
Robillard
Rogers
Rudd
Saheta
Samson
Sansoucy
Scarpaleggia
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Sorbara
Stetski
Tassi
Trudeau
Vandal
Vaughan
Wee
Wilkinson
Wrzesnewskyj
Young — 197

France (Central Nova)
Fuhr
Garrison
Gill
Gourde
Hyde
Hardie
Hehr
Holland
Hutchings
Johns
Joly
Jowhari
Khera
Lametti
Lapointe
Lavallée
Lefebvre
Levitt
Lockhart
Longfield
MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Mahoney
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
May (Cambridge)
McCrimmon
McGinty
McKenna
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendicino
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-

Moore
Morrissey
Nantel
Nault
Oliver
Ouellette
Patzer
Pettipas Taylor
Picard
Qualtrough
Rankin
Rioux
Rodriguez
Romanado
Rotiers
Saini
Sangha
Sarai
Schulte
Spro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Spengemann
Tan
Tootoo
Trudel
Vandenbeld
Virani
Whalen
Wilson-Raybould
Yip

PAIRED

Members

Graham
Ste-Marie

LeBlanc
Thériault — 4

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 1 defeated. I therefore declare Motions Nos. 2 to 46 defeated.

[*English*]

The next question is on Motion No. 47. The vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 48 to 67.

● (1530)

(The House divided on Motion No. 47, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 692)

YEAS

Members

Aboultaif
Allison
Barlow
Bergen
Berthold
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Calkins
Chong
Cooper
Doherty
Eglinski
Falk (Provencher)
Finley
Generoux
Gladu
Gourde
Jeneroux
Kent
Kmiec
Lake
Lemieux
Liepert
Lobreau
McCauley (Edmonton West)
Motz
Nicholson
Obhrai
Poilievre
Reid
Saroya
Schmale
Shipley
Stanton
Stubbs
Tilson
Van Kesteren
Vecchio
Wagantall
Waugh
Wong

Albrecht
Anderson
Benson
Bezan
Boon
Brassard
Carrie
Clarke
Dalton
Deltell
Dreeshen
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Fast
Gallant
Genuis
Gerbi
Hardy
Kelly
Kitchen
Kusie
Lauzon (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Lobb
MacKenzie
Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound)
Nater
Nuttall
Paul-Hus
Rayes
Richards
Scheer
Shields
Sorenson
Strahl
Sweet
Trost
Van Loan
Viersen
Warkentin
Webber
Yurdiga — 78

NAYS

Members

Aldag
Alleslev
Argue
Arya
Ayoub
Bagnell
Barsalou-Duval
Beaulieu
Bennett
Bibeau
Blaikie
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Bossio
Boudrias
Boutin
Brosseau
Cannings
Casey (Charlottetown)
Chen
Cormier
Currie
Dansereau
Dhaliwal
Dhillon
Dubé
Duclos
Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Duvall

Alghabra
Amos
Arseneault
Aubin
Badawey
Bains
Baylis
Beech
Benson
Bittle
Blair
Boissonnault
Boudrias
Boutin-Sweet
Breton
Caesar-Chavannes
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Chagger
Choquette
Cullen
Dabrusin
Davies
Dhaliwal
Drouin
Dubourg
Dugid
Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)
Dzerowicz

Ehsassi
Ellis
Eyking
Fillmore
Fisher
Fortier
Fragiskatos
Fraser (Central Nova)
Fuhr
Garrison
Gill
Goodale
Hajdu
Hardie
Hehr
Holland
Hutchings
Johns
Joly
Jowhari
Khera
Lametti
Lapointe
Laverdière
Lefebvre
Levitt
Lockhart
Longfield
MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Maloney
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
Mathyssen
May (Cambridge)
McCrimmon
McGuinty
McKenna
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendicino
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Soeurs)
Monsef
Moore
Morrissey
Nantel
Nault
Oliver
Ouellette
Pauzé
Petitpas Taylor
Picard
Qualtrough
Rankin
Ratansi
Rodriguez
Romanado
Rumy
Saini
Sangha
Sarai
Schulte
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Spengemann
Tan
Tootoo
Trudel
Vandenbeld
Virani
Whalen
Wilson-Raybould
Yip
El Khoury
Erskine-Smith
Eyolfson
Finnigan
Fonseca
Fortin
Fraser (West Nova)
Fry
Garneau
Gerretsen
Goldsmith-Jones
Gould
Hardcastle
Hébert
Hogg
Hughes
Iacono
Jolibois
Jordan
Khalid
Lambropoulos
Lamoureux
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Lebouthillier
Leslie
Lightbound
Long
Ludwig
MacGregor
Malcolmson
Marcil
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
McDonald
McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Mendès
Mihychuk
Morneau
Murray
Nassif
Ng
O'Regan
Paradis
Peschisolido
Philpott
Poissant
Ramsey
Ratansi
Robillard
Rogers
Rudd
Sahota
Samson
Sansoucy
Scarpaleggia
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Sorbara
Stetski
Tassi
Trudeau
Vandal
Vaughan
Weir
Wilkinson
Wrzesnewskyj
Young — 198

PAIRED

Members

Graham — Lefebvre
Ste-Marie — Thériault — 4

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 47 defeated. I therefore declare Motions Nos. 48 to 67 defeated.

[*Translation*]

The question is on Motion No. 68. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 70 to 72, 74 to 94, 96, and 98 to 119.

● (1530)

(The House divided on Motion No. 68, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 693)

YEAS

Members

Aboultaif
Allison
Angus
Barlow
Benson
Bergen
Berthold
Blaikie
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Boulerice
Brassard
Calkins
Carrie
Choquette
Cooper
Davies
Doherty
Dubé
Duvall
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Fast
Fortin
Garrison
Genuis
Godin
Hardcastle
Hughes
Johns
Kelly
Kitchen
Kusie
Lauzon (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Liepert
Lukiwski
MacKenzie
Marcil
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound)
Motz
Nater
Nuttall
Paul-Hus
Plamondon
Ramsey
Rayes
Richards
Saroya
Schmale
Shipley
Stanton
Strahl
Sweet
Trost
Van Kesteren
Vecchio
Wagantall
Waugh
Weir
Yurdiga — 117

Albrecht
Anderson
Aubin
Beaulieu
Benzen
Bernier
Bezan
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Boudrias
Boutin-Sweet
Brosseau
Cummings
Chong
Clarke
Cullen
Deltell
Dreeshen
Duncan (Edmonton—Strathcona)
Eglinski
Falk (Provencher)
Finley
Gallant
Généreux
Gladu
Gourde
Harder
Jeneroux
Johns
Kent
Kmiec
Lake
Laverdière
Lobb
MacGregor
Malcolmson
Mathyssen
McCauley (Edmonton West)
Moore
Nantel
Nicholson
Obhrai
Pauzé
Poilievre
Rankin
Reid
Sansoucy
Scheer
Shields
Sorenson
Stetski
Stubbs
Tilson
Trudel
Van Loan
Viersen
Warkentin
Webber
Wong

NAYS

Members

Aldag
Alleslev
Arseneault
Alghabra
Amos
Arya

Ayoub
Bagnell
Baylis
Bennett
Bittle
Boissonnault
Bratina
Caesar-Chavannes
Casey (Charlottetown)
Chen
Cuzner
Dubnoff
Dhaliwal
Drouin
Duclos
Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Ehsassi
Ellis
Eyking
Fillmore
Fisher
Fortier
Fraser (West Nova)
Fry
Garneau
Goldsmith-Jones
Hajdu
Hébert
Hogg
Hutchings
Joly
Jowhari
Khera
Lametti
Lapointe
Lebouthillier
Leslie
Lightbound
Long
Ludwig
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
May (Cambridge)
McCrimmon
McGuinty
McKenna
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendicino
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Sœurs)
Monsef
Morneau
Murray
Nault
Oliver
Ouellette
Peschisolido
Philpott
Poissant
Ratansi
Robillard
Rogers
Rudd
Sahota
Samson
Sarai
Schulte
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Spengemann
Tassi
Trudeau
Vandenbeld
Virani
Wilkinson
Wrzesnewskyj
Young — 157

Badawey
Bains
Beech
Ribeau
Blair
Bossio
Breton
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Chagger
Cormier
Dabrusin
DeCourcey
Dhillon
Dubourg
Duguid
Dzerowicz
El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith
Eyolfson
Finnigan
Fonseca
Fragiskatos
Fraser (Central Nova)
Fuhr
Gerretsen
Goodale
Hardie
Hehr
Holland
Iacono
Jordan
Khalid
Lambropoulos
Lamoureux
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Lefebvre
Levitt
Lockhart
Longfield
MacAulay (Cardigan)
Maloney

McDonald
McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Mendès
Mihychuk

Morrissey
Nassif
Ng
O'Regan
Paradis
Petitpas Taylor
Picard
Qualtrough
Rioux
Rodriguez
Romanado
Rumiy
Saini
Sangha
Scarpaleggia
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Sorbara
Tan
Tootoo
Vandal
Vaughan
Whalen
Wilson-Raybould
Yip

PAIRED

Members

Graham — LeBlanc

Ste. Marie — Theriault — 4

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 68 defeated. I therefore declare Motions Nos. 70 to 72, 74 to 94, 96, and 98 to 119 defeated.

[*English*]

The next question is on Motion No. 69. A vote on this motion also applies to Motion Nos. 73, 95, and 97.

● (1540)

(The House divided on Motion No. 69, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 694)

YEAS

Members

Aboultaif
Allison
Angus
Barlow
Benzen
Bernier
Bezan
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Boulerice
Brassard
Calkins
Carrie
Choquette
Cooper
Davies
Doherty
Dubé
Duvall
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Fast
Gallant
Généreux
Gladu
Gourde
Harder
Jeneroux
Johns
Kent
Kmiec
Lake
Laverdière
Lobb
MacGregor
Malcolmson
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound)
Motz
Nater
Nuttall
Paul-Hus
Ramsey
Rayes
Richards
Saroya
Schmale
Shipley
Stanton
Strahl
Sweet
Trost
Van Kesteren
Vecchio
Wagantall
Waugh
Weir
Yurdiga — 111

Albrecht
Anderson
Aubin
Benson
Bergen
Berthold
Blaikie
Blaney (Hellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Boutin-Sweet
Brosseau
Cannings
Chong
Clarke
Cullen
Deltell
Dreeshen
Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)
Eglinski
Falk (Provencher)
Finley
Garrison
Genuis
Godin
Hardcastle
Hughes
Johns
Kelly
Kitchen
Kuste
Lauzon (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Liepert
Lukiwski
MacKenzie
Mathyssen
McCauley (Edmonton West)
Moore
Nantel
Nicholson
Obhrai
Poilievre
Rankin
Reid
Samson
Scheer
Shields
Sorenson
Stetski
Stubbs
Tilson
Trudel
Van Loan
Viersen
Warkentin
Webber
Wong

NAYS

Members

Alghabra — Aldag

Allesley
Arseneault
Ayoub
Bagnell
Barsalou-Duval
Beaulieu
Bennett
Bittle
Boissonnault
Boudrias
Breton
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Chagger
Cormier
Dabrusin
DeCourcey
Dhillon
Dubourg
Duguid
Dzerowicz
El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith
Eyolfson
Finnigan
Fonseca
Fortin
Fraser (West Nova)
Fry
Garneau
Gill
Goodale
Hardie
Hehr
Holland
Iacono
Jordan
Khalid
Lambropoulos
Lamoureux
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Lefebvre
Levitt
Lockhart
Longfield
MacAulay (Cardigan)
Maloney
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
May (Cambridge)
McCrimmon
McGuinty
McKenna
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendicino
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Soeurs)
Monsef
Morneau
Murray
Nault
Oliver
Ouellette
Pauzé
Petitpas Taylor
Plamondon
Qualtrough
Rioux
Rodriguez
Romanado
Ruimy
Saini
Sangha
Scarpaleggia
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Sorbara
Tan
Tootoo
Vandal
Vaughan
Whalen
Wilson-Raybould
Yip
Amos
Arya
Badawey
Bains
Baylis
Beech
Bibeau
Blair
Bossio
Bratina
Caesar-Chavannes
Casey (Charlottetown)
Chen
Cuzner
Damoff
Dhaliwal
Drouin
Ducks
Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Ehsassi
Ellis
Eyking
Fillmore
Fisher
Fortier
Fragiskatos
Fraser (Central Nova)
Fuhr
Gerretsen
Goldsmith-Jones
Hajdu
Hébert
Hogg
Hutchings
Joly
Jowhari
Khera
Lametti
Lapointe
Lebouthillier
Leslie
Lightbound
Long
Ludwig
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Marcil
McDonald
McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Mendès
Mihychuk
Morrissey
Nassif
Ng
O'Regan
Paradis
Peschisolido
Philpott
Poissant
Ratansi
Robillard
Rogers
Rudd
Sahota
Samson
Sarai
Schulte
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Spengemann
Tassi
Trudeau
Vandenbeld
Virani
Wilkinson
Wrzesnewskyj
Young — 164

PAIRED

Members

Graham — LeBlanc
Ste. Marie — Thériault — 4

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 69 defeated. I therefore declare Motions Nos. 73, 95, and 97 defeated.

[Translation]

The question is on Motion No. 120. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 121 to 185.

● (1545)

(The House divided on Motion No. 120, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 695)

YEAS

Members

Albrecht
Anderson
Benzen
Berthold
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Calkins
Chong
Cooper
Doherty
Eglinski
Falk (Provencher)
Finley
Généreux
Gladu
Gourde
Jeneroux
Kent
Kmiec
Lake
Liepert
Lukiwski
McCauley (Edmonton West)
Motz
Nicholson
Oblrai
Poilievre
Reid
Saroya
Shields
Sorenson
Strahl
Sweet
Trost
Van Loan
Viersen
Warkentin
Webber
Yurdiga — 75

Allison
Barlow
Bernier
Bezan
Brassard
Carrie
Clarke
Deltell
Dreeshen
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Fast
Gallant
Genuis
Godin
Harder
Kelly
Kitchen
Kusie
Lauzon (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Lobb
MacKenzie
Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound)
Nater
Nuttall
Paul-Hus
Rayes
Richards
Schmale
Shipley
Stanton
Stubbs
Tilson
Van Kesteren
Vecchio
Waugantall
Waugh
Wong

NAYS

Members

Aldag
Allesley
Angus
Arya
Ayoub
Bagnell
Baylis
Beech
Benson
Bittle
Blair
Boissonnault
Boudrias
Boutin-Sweet
Alghabra
Amos
Arseneault
Aubin
Badawey
Barsalou-Duval
Beaulieu
Bennett
Bibeau
Blaikie
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Bossio
Boulerice
Bratina

Breton
Caesar Chavannes
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Chagger
Choquette
Cullen
Dabrusin
Davies
Dhaliwal
Drouin
Dubourg
Duguid
Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)
Dzerowicz
El Khoury
Erskine-Smith
Eyolfson
Finnigan
Fonseca
Fortin
Fraser (West Nova)
Fry
Garneau
Gerretsen
Goldsmith-Jones
Hajdu
Hardie
Hehr
Holland
Hutchings
Johns
Joly
Jowhari
Khera
Lametti
Lapointe
Laverdière
Lefebvre
Levitt
Lockhart
Longfield
MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Maloney
Mathyssen
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
McDonald
McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Mendès
Mihychuk
Soeurs)
Monsef
Morneau
Murray
Nassif
Ng
O'Regan
Paradis
Peschisolido
Philpott
Plamondon
Qualtrough
Rankin
Rioux
Rodriguez
Romanado
Ruimy
Saini
Sangha
Sarai
Schulte
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Spengemann
Tan
Tootoo
Trudel
Vandenbeld
Virani
Whalen
Wilson-Raybould

Brosseau
Cummings
Casey (Charlottetown)
Chen
Cormier
Cuzner
Damoff
DeCourcey
Dhillon
Dubé
Ducks
Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Duvall
Ehsassi
Ellis
Eyking
Fillmore
Fisher
Fortier
Fragiskatos
Fraser (Central Nova)
Fuhr
Garrison
Gill
Goodale
Hardcastle
Hébert
Hogg
Hughes
Iacono
Jolibois
Jordan
Khalid
Lambropoulos
Lamoureux
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Lebouthillier
Leslie
Lightbound
Long
Ludwig
MacGregor
Malcolmson
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
May (Cambridge)
McCrimmon
McGuinty
McKenna
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendicino
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-

Moore
Morrissey
Nantel
Nault
Oliver
Ouellette
Pauzé
Petitpas Taylor
Picard
Poissant
Ramsey
Ratansi
Robillard
Rogers
Rudd
Sahota
Samson
Samson
Scarpaleggia
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Sorbara
Stetski
Tassi
Trudeau
Vandal
Vaughan
Weir
Wilkinson
Wrzesnewskyj

Yip
Young 196

PAIRED

Members

Graham
Ste-Marie
LeBlanc
Thériault 4

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 120 defeated. I therefore declare Motions Nos. 121 to 185 defeated.

[*English*]

The next question is on Motion No. 186. The vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 187 to 198.

● (1555)

(The House divided on Motion No. 186, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 696)

YEAS

Members

Aboultaif
Allison
Barlow
Bernier
Bezan
Brassard
Carrie
Clarke
Deltell
Doherty
Eglinski
Falk (Provencher)
Finley
Généreux
Gladu
Gourde
Jeneroux
Kent
Kmiec
Lake
Liepert
Lukiwski
McCauley (Edmonton West)
Motz
Nicholson
Obhrai
Rayes
Richards
Schmale
Shipley
Stanton
Stubbs
Tilson
Van Kesteren
Vecchio
Wagantall
Waugh
Wong

Albrecht
Anderson
Benzen
Berthold
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Calkins
Chong
Cooper
Diotte
Dreeshen
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Fast
Gallant
Genuis
Godin
Harder
Kelly
Kitchen
Kusie
Lauzon (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Lobb
MacKenzie
Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound)
Nater
Nuttall
Poilievre
Reid
Saroya
Shields
Sorenson
Strahl
Sweet
Trost
Van Loan
Viersen
Warkentin
Webber
Yurdiga 76

NAYS

Members

Aldag
Allesley
Angus
Arya
Ayoub
Bagnell
Baylis
Beech
Benson
Bittle
Blair
Boissonnault

Alghabra
Amos
Arseneault
Aubin
Badawey
Barsalou-Duval
Beaulieu
Bennett
Bibeau
Blaikie
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Bossio

Boulerice
Bratina
Brosseau
Cannings
Casey (Charlottetown)
Chen
Cormier
Cuzner
Damoff
DeCourcey
Dhillon
Dubé
Duclos
Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Duvall
Ehsassi
Ellis
Eyking
Fillmore
Fisher
Fortier
Fragiskatos
Fraser (Central Nova)
Fuhr
Garrison
Gill
Goodale
Hardcastle
Hébert
Hogg
Hughes
Iacono
Jolibois
Jordan
Khalid
Lambropoulos
Lamoureux
Lauzon (Argenteuil — La Petite Nation)
Lebouthillier
Leslie
Lightbound
Long
Ludwig
MacGregor
Malcolmson
Massé (Avignon — La Mitis — Matane — Matapédia)
Mathyssen
May (Cambridge)
McCrimmon
McGuinty
McKenna
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendicino
Miller (Ville-Marie — Le Sud-Ouest — Île-des-Sœurs)
Monsef
Moore
Morrissey
Nantel
Ng
O'Regan
Paradis
Peschisolido
Philpott
Plamondon
Qualtrough
Rankin
Rioux
Rodriguez
Romanado
Ruimy
Saini
Sangha
Sarai
Schulte
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Spengemann
Tan
Tootoo
Trudel
Vandenbeld
Virani
Boutin-Sweet
Breton
Caesar-Chavannes
Casey (Cumberland — Colchester)
Chagger
Choquette
Cullen
Dabrusin
Davies
Dhaliwal
Drouin
Dubourg
Duguid
Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)
Dzerowicz
El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith
Eyolfson
Finnigan
Fonseca
Fortin
Fraser (West Nova)
Fry
Garneau
Gerretsen
Goldsmith-Jones
Hajdu
Hardie
Hehr
Holland
Hutchings
Johns
Joly
Jowhari
Khera
Lametti
Lapointe
Laverdière
Lefebvre
Levitt
Lockhart
Longfield
MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Maloney
May (Saanich — Gulf Islands)
McDonald
McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam — Port Coquitlam)
Mendès
Mihychuk
Morneau
Murray
Nassif
Oliver
Ouellette
Pauzé
Petitpas Taylor
Picard
Poissant
Ramsey
Ratansi
Robillard
Rogers
Rudd
Sahota
Samson
Sansoucy
Scarpaleggia
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Mission — Matsqui — Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Sorbara
Stetski
Tassi
Trudeau
Vandal
Vaughan
Weir
Whalen
Wilson-Raybould
Yip
Wilkinson
Wrzesnewskyj
Young — 194

PAIRED

Members

Graham
Ste-Marie
LeBlanc
Thériault — 4

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 186 defeated. I therefore declare Motions Nos. 187 to 198 defeated.

[*Translation*]

The question is on Motion No. 199. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 200 and 201.

● (1600)

(The House divided on Motion No. 199, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 697)

YEAS

Members

Aboultaif
Allison
Barlow
Bernier
Bezan
Brassard
Carrie
Clarke
Deltell
Doherty
Eglinski
Falk (Provencher)
Finley
Généreux
Gladu
Gourde
Jeneroux
Kent
Kmiec
Lake
Liepert
Lukiwski
McCauley (Edmonton West)
Motz
Nicholson
Obhrai
Rayes
Richards
Schmale
Shipley
Stanton
Stubbs
Tilson
Van Kesteren
Vecchio
Wagantall
Waugh
Wong
Albrecht
Anderson
Benzen
Berthold
Blaney (Bellechasse — Les Etchemins — Lévis)
Calkins
Chong
Cooper
Diotte
Dreeshen
Falk (Battlefords — Lloydminster)
Fast
Gallant
Genuis
Godin
Harder
Kelly
Kitchen
Kusie
Lauzon (Stormont — Dundas — South Glengarry)
Lobb
MacKenzie
Miller (Bruce — Grey — Owen Sound)
Nater
Nuttall
Poilievre
Reid
Saroya
Shields
Sorenson
Strahl
Sweet
Trost
Van Loan
Viersen
Warkentin
Webber
Yurdiga — 76

NAYS

Members

Aldag
Alleslev
Angus
Arya
Ayoub
Bagnell
Baylis
Beech
Benson
Bittle
Blair
Alghabra
Amos
Arseneault
Aubin
Badawey
Barsalou-Duval
Beaulieu
Bennett
Bibeau
Blaikie
Blaney (North Island — Powell River)

Boissonnault
Boulerice
Bratina
Breguet
Cannings
Casey (Charlottetown)
Chen
Cormier
Cuzner
Damoff
DeCourcey
Dhillon
Dubé
Duclos
Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Duvall
El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith
Eyolfson
Finnigan
Fonseca
Fortin
Fraser (West Nova)
Fry
Garneau
Gerretsen
Goldsmith-Jones
Gould
Hardcastle
Hébert
Hogg
Hughes
Iacono
Jolibois
Jordan
Khalid
Lambropoulos
Lamoureux
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Lebouthillier
Leslie
Lightbound
Long
Ludwig
MacGregor
Malcolmson
Marcil
Mathyssen
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
McDonald
McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Mendès
Mihychuk
Socurs)
Monsef
Morneau
Murray
Nassif
Ng
O'Regan
Paradis
Peschisolido
Philpott
Plamondon
Qualtrough
Rankin
Rioux
Rodriguez
Romanado
Ruimy
Saini
Sangha
Sarai
Schulte
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Spengemann
Tan
Tootoo
Trudel
Vandenbeld
Rosso
Boutin-Sweet
Breton
Caesar-Chavannes
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Chagger
Choquette
Cullen
Dabrusin
Davies
Dhaliwal
Drouin
Dubourg
Duguid
Duncan (Edmonton—Strathcona)
Ehsassi
Ellis
Eyking
Fillmore
Fisher
Fortier
Fragiskatos
Fraser (Central Nova)
Fuhr
Garrison
Gill
Goodale
Hajdu
Hardie
Hehr
Holland
Hutchings
Johns
Joly
Jowhari
Khera
Lametti
Lapointe
Laverdière
Lefebvre
Levitt
Lockhart
Longfield
MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Maloney
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
May (Cambridge)
McCrimmon
McGuinty
McKenna
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendicino
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-
Moore
Morrissey
Nantel
Nault
Oliver
Ouellette
Pauzé
Petitpas Taylor
Picard
Poissant
Ramsey
Ratansi
Robillard
Rogers
Rudd
Sahota
Samson
Sansoucy
Scarpaleggia
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Sorbara
Stetski
Tassi
Trudeau
Vandal
Vaughan
Virani
Whalen
Wilson-Raybould
Yip
Wrzesnewskyj
Young — 196

PAIRED

Members

Graham
Ste-Marie
LeBlanc
Thériault — 4

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 199 defeated. I therefore declare Motions Nos. 200 and 201 defeated.

[English]

The question is on Motion No. 202. The vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 203 to 213.

● (1610)

(The House divided on Motion No. 202, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 698)

YEAS

Members

Aboultaif
Allison
Barlow
Bergen
Berthold
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Calkins
Chong
Cooper
Diotte
Dreeshen
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Fast
Généreux
Gladu
Gourde
Jeneroux
Kent
Kmiec
Lake
Liepert
Lukiwski
McCauley (Edmonton West)
Motz
Nicholson
Obhrai
Poilievre
Reid
Saroya
Shields
Sorenson
Strahl
Sweet
Trost
Van Loan
Viersen
Warkentin
Webber
Yurdiga — 77

Albrecht
Anderson
Benzen
Bernier
Bezan
Brassard
Carrie
Clarke
Deltell
Doherty
Eglinski
Falk (Provencher)
Finley
Genuis
Godin
Harder
Kelly
Kitchen
Kusie
Lauzon (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Lobb
MacKenzie
Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound)
Nater
Nuttall
Paul-Hus
Rayes
Richards
Schmale
Shipley
Stanton
Stubbs
Tilson
Van Kesteren
Vecchio
Wagantall
Waugh
Wong

NAYS

Members

Aldag
Alleslev
Angus
Arya
Ayoub
Bagnell
Baylis
Beech
Benson
Alghabra
Amos
Arseneault
Aubin
Badawey
Barsalou-Duval
Beaulieu
Bennett
Bibeau

Battle
Blair
Boissonnault
Boudrias
Boutin-Sweet
Breton
Caesar-Chavannes
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Chagger
Choquette
Cuzner
Damoff
DeCourcey
Dhillon
Dubé
Duclos
Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Duvall
Ehsassi
Ellis
Eyking
Fillmore
Fisher
Fortier
Fragiskatos
Fraser (Central Nova)
Fuhr
Garrison
Gill
Goodale
Hajdu
Hardie
Hehr
Holland
Hutchings
Johns
Joly
Jowhari
Khera
Lametti
Lapointe
Laverdière
Lefebvre
Levitt
Lockhart
Longfield
MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Maloney
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
Mathyssen
May (Cambridge)
McCrimmon
McGuinty
McKenna
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mihychuk
Socurs)
Monsef
Morneau
Murray
Nassif
Ng
O'Regan
Paradis
Peschisolido
Philpott
Plamondon
Qualtrough
Rankin
Rioux
Rodriguez
Romanado
Rumny
Saini
Sangha
Sarai
Schulte
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Spengemann
Tan
Blaikie
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Bossio
Boulerice
Bratina
Brosseau
Cannings
Casey (Charlottetown)
Chen
Cormier
Dubrusin
Davies
Dhaliwal
Drouin
Dubourg
Duguid
Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)
Dzerowicz
El Khoury
Erskine-Smith
Eyolfson
Finnigan
Fonseca
Fortin
Fraser (West Nova)
Fry
Gameau
Gerretsen
Goldsmith-Jones
Gould
Hardcastle
Hébert
Hogg
Hughes
Iacono
Jolibois
Jordan
Khalid
Lambropoulos
Lamoureux
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Lebouthillier
Leslie
Lightbound
Long
Ludwig
MacGregor
Malcolmson
Marcil
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
McDonald
McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Mendicino
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-
Moore
Morrissey
Nantel
Nault
Oliver
Ouellette
Pauzé
Petitpas Taylor
Picard
Poissant
Ramsey
Ratansi
Robillard
Rogers
Rudd
Sahota
Samson
Sansoucy
Scarpaleggia
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Sorbara
Stetski
Tassi
Tootoo
Trudel
Vandenbeld
Virani
Whalen
Wilson-Raybould
Yip
Trudeau
Vandal
Vaughan
Weir
Wilkinson
Wrzesnewskyj
Young — 196

PAIRED

Members

Graham
Ste-Marie
LeBlanc
Thériault — 4

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 202 lost. I therefore declare Motions Nos. 203 to 213 lost.

[*Translation*]

The question is on Motion No. 214. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 215 to 219.

● (1615)

(The House divided on Motion No. 214, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 699)

YEAS

Members

Aboultaif
Allison
Barlow
Bergen
Berthold
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Calkins
Chong
Cooper
Diotte
Dreeshen
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Fast
Généreux
Gladu
Harder
Kelly
Kitchen
Kusie
Lauzon (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Lobb
MacKenzie
Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound)
Nater
Nuttall
Paul-Hus
Rayes
Richards
Schmale
Shipley
Stanton
Stubbs
Tilson
Van Kesteren
Vecchio
Wagantall
Waugh
Wong
Albrecht
Anderson
Benzen
Bernier
Bezan
Brassard
Carrie
Clarke
Dehell
Doherty
Eglinski
Falk (Provencher)
Finley
Genuis
Godin
Generoux
Kent
Kmiec
Lake
Liepert
Lukiwski
McCauley (Edmonton West)
Motz
Nicholson
Obhrai
Poilievre
Reid
Saroya
Shields
Sorenson
Strahl
Sweet
Trost
Van Loan
Viersen
Warkentin
Webber
Yurdiga — 76

NAYS

Members

Aldag
Allendev
Angus
Arya
Ayoub
Bagnell
Bayliss
Alghabra
Amos
Arseneault
Aubin
Badawey
Barsalou-Duval
Beaulieu

Beech
Benson
Bittle
Blair
Boissonnault
Boudrias
Boutin-Sweet
Breton
Caesar-Chavannes
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Chagger
Choquette
Cuzner
Damoff
DeCourcey
Dhillon
Dubé
Duclos
Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Duvall
Ehsassi
Ellis
Eyking
Fillmore
Fisher
Fortier
Fragiskatos
Fraser (Central Nova)
Fuhr
Garrison
Gill
Goodale
Hajdu
Hardie
Hehr
Holland
Hutchings
Johns
Joly
Jowhari
Khera
Lametti
Lapointe
Laverdière
Lefebvre
Levitt
Lockhart
Longfield
MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Maloney
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
Mathyssen
May (Cambridge)
McCrimmon
McGuinty
McKenna
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mihychuk
Monsef
Morneau
Murray
Nassif
Ng
O'Regan
Paradis
Peschisolido
Philpott
Plamondon
Qualtrough
Rankin
Rioux
Rodriguez
Romanado
Ruimy
Saini
Sangha
Sarai
Schulte
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Bennett
Bibeau
Blaikie
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Bossio
Boulerice
Bratina
Brosseau
Cannings
Casey (Charlottetown)
Chen
Cormier
Dabrusin
Davies
Dhaliwal
Drouin
Dubourg
Duguid
Duncan (Edmonton—Strathcona)
Dzerowicz
El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith
Eyolfson
Finnigan
Fonseca
Fortin
Fraser (West Nova)
Fry
Garneau
Gerretsen
Goldsmith-Jones
Gould
Hardcastle
Hébert
Hogg
Hughes
Iacono
Jolibois
Jordan
Khalid
Lambropoulos
Lamoureux
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Lebouthillier
Leslie
Lightbound
Long
Ludwig
MacGregor
Malcolmson
Marcil
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
McDonald
McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Mendicino
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Sœurs)
Moore
Morrissey
Nantel
Nault
Oliver
Ouellette
Pauzé
Peterpas Taylor
Picard
Poissant
Ramsey
Ratansi
Robillard
Rogers
Rudd
Sahota
Samson
Sansoucy
Scarpaleggia
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Sorbara
Spengemann
Tan
Tootoo
Trudel
Vandenbeld
Virani
Whalen
Wilson-Raybould
Yip
Stetski
Tassi
Trudeau
Vandal
Vaughan
Weir
Wilkinson
Wrzesnewskyj
Young — 196

PAIRED

Members

Graham
Ste-Marie
LeBlanc
Thériault — 4

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 214 defeated. I therefore declare Motions Nos. 215 to 219 defeated.

[*English*]

The next question is on Motion No. 220. A vote on this motion also applies to Motion No. 221.

● (1625)

(The House divided on Motion No. 220, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 700)

YEAS

Members

Aboultaif
Allison
Barlow
Bergen
Berthold
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Levis)
Calkins
Chong
Cooper
Diotte
Dreeshen
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Fast
Gallant
Genuis
Godin
Harder
Kelly
Kitchen
Kusie
Lauzon (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Lobb
MacKenzie
Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound)
Nater
Nuttall
Paul-Hus
Rayes
Richards
Schmale
Shipley
Stanton
Stubbs
Tilson
Van Kesteren
Vecchio
Wagantall
Waugh
Wong
Albrecht
Anderson
Benzen
Bernier
Bezan
Brassard
Carrie
Clarke
Deltell
Doherty
Eglinski
Falk (Provencher)
Finley
Généreux
Gladu
Gourde
Jeneroux
Kent
Kmiec
Lake
Liepert
Lukiwski
McCauley (Edmonton West)
Motz
Nicholson
Obhrai
Poilievre
Reid
Saroya
Shields
Sorenson
Strahl
Sweet
Trost
Van Loan
Viersen
Warkentin
Webber
Yurdiga — 78

NAYS

Members

Aldag
Allesley
Angus
Alghabra
Amos
Arseneault

Arya
Aubin
Ayoub
Badawey
Bagnell
Barsalou-Duval
Baylis
Beaulieu
Beech
Bennett
Benson
Bibeau
Bittle
Blaikie
Blair
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Boissonnault
Bossio
Boudrias
Boulerice
Bourassa
Bratina
Breton
Brosseau
Caesar-Chavannes
Cannings
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Casey (Charlottetown)
Chagger
Chen
Choquette
Cormier
Cullen
Cuzner
Dabrusin
Damoff
Davies
DeCourcey
Dhaliwal
Dhillon
Drouin
Dubourg
Duclos
Duguid
Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)
Duvall
Dzerowicz
Ehsassi
El Khoury
Ellis
Erskine-Smith
Eyking
Eyolfson
Fillmore
Finnigan
Fisher
Fonseca
Fortier
Fortin
Fraser (West Nova)
Fraser (Central Nova)
Fry
Fuhr
Garneau
Garrison
Gerretsen
Gill
Goldsmith-Jones
Goodale
Gould
Hajdu
Hardcastle
Hardie
Hébert
Hehr
Hogg
Holland
Hughes
Hutchings
Iacono
Johns
Jolibois
Joly
Jordan
Jowhari
Khalid
Khera
Lambropoulos
Lametti
Lamoureux
Lapointe
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Laverdière
Lebouthillier
Lefebvre
Leslie
Levitt
Lightbound
Lockhart
Long
Longfield
Ludwig
MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacGregor
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Malcolmson
Maloney
Marcil
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
Mathyssen
May (Cambridge)
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
McCrimmon
McDonald
McGuinty
McKay
McKenna
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendès
Mendicino
Mihychuk
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Sœurs)
Monsef
Moore
Moreau
Morrissey
Murray
Nantel
Nassif
Nault
Ng
Oliver
O'Regan
Ouellette
Paradis
Pauzé
Peschisolido
Petitpas Taylor
Philpott
Picard
Plamondon
Poissant
Qualtrough
Ramsey
Rankin
Ratansi
Rioux
Robillard
Rodriguez
Rogers
Romanado
Rudd
Ruimy
Sahota
Saini
Samson
Sangha
Sansoucy
Sarai
Scarpaleggia
Schulte
Serré
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Spengemann
Tan
Tootoo
Trudel
Vandenbeld
Vaughan
Virani
Weir
Whalen
Wilkinson
Wilson-Raybould
Wrzesnewskyj
Yip
Young—196

Shanahan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Sorbara
Stetski
Tassi
Trudeau
Vandal
Vaughan
Weir
Wilkinson
Wrzesnewskyj
Young—196

PAIRED

Members

Graham—Leblanc
Ste-Marie—Thériault—4

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 220 defeated. I therefore declare Motion No. 221 defeated.

[*Translation*]

The next question is on Motion No. 222.

● (1630)

[*English*]

(The House divided on Motion No. 222, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 701)

YEAS

Members

Aboultaif
Albrecht
Allison
Anderson
Barlow
Benzen
Bergen
Bernier
Berthold
Bezan
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Brassard
Calkins
Carrie
Chong
Clarke
Cooper
Deltell
Diotte
Doherty
Dreeshen
Eglinski
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Falk (Provencher)
Finley
Gallant
Généreux
Genuis
Gladu
Godin
Goodridge
Harder
Jeneroux
Kelly
Kent
Kitchen
Kmiec
Kusie
Lake
Lauzon (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Liepert
Lloyd
Lobb
Lukiwski
MacKenzie
McCauley (Edmonton West)
Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound)
Motz
Nater
Nicholson
Nuttall
Obhrai
Paul-Hus
Poilievre
Rayes
Reid
Richards
Saroya
Schmale
Shields
Shipley
Sorenson
Stanton
Strahl
Stubbs
Sweet
Tilson
Trost
Van Kesteren
Van Loan
Vecchio
Viersen
Wagantall
Warkentin
Waugh
Webber
Wong
Yurdiga—79

NAYS

Members

Aldag
Alleslev
Angus
Arya
Ayoub
Bagnell
Baylis
Beech
Benson
Bittle
Blair
Boissonnault
Boudrias
Boutin-Sweet
Breton
Caesar-Chavannes
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Chagger
Choquette
Cullen
Dabrusin
Davies
Dhaliwal
Drouin
Dubourg
Duguid
Duncan (Edmonton—Strathcona)
Dzerowicz
El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith
Eyolfson
Finnigan
Fonseca
Fortin
Fraser (West Nova)
Fry
Garneau
Gerretsen
Goldsmith-Jones
Gould
Hardcastle
Hébert
Hogg
Hughes
Iacono
Jolibois
Jordan
Khalid
Lambropoulos
Lamoureux
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Lebouthillier
Leslie
Lightbound
Long
Ludwig
MacGregor
Malcolmson
Marcil
Mathyssen
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
McDonald
McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Mendès
Mihychuk
Socurs)
Monsef
Morneau
Murray
Nassif
Ng
O'Regan
Paradis
Peschisolido
Philpott
Plamondon
Qualtrough
Rankin
Rioux
Rodriguez
Romanado
Rumny
Saini
Sangha
Sarai
Schulte
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Spengemann
Tan
Trudeau
Vandal
Vaughan
Wein
Wilkinson
Wrzesnewskyj
Young — 197

Alghabra
Amos
Arseneault
Aubin
Badawey
Bazinet-Duval
Beaudin
Bennett
Bibeau
Blaikie
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Bossio
Boutierice
Bratina
Breoseau
Cannings
Casey (Charlottetown)
Chen
Cormier
Cuzner
Damoff
DeCourcey
Dhillon
Dubé
Duclos
Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Duvall
Ehsassi
Ellis
Eyking
Fillmore
Fisher
Fortier
Fragiskatos
Fraser (Central Nova)
Fuhr
Garrison
Gill
Goodale
Hajdu
Hardie
Hehr
Holland
Hutchings
Johns
Joly
Jowhari
Khera
Lametti
Lapointe
Laverdière
Lefebvre
Levitt
Lockhart
Longfield
MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Maloney
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
May (Cambridge)
McCrimmon
McGuinty
McKenna
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendicino
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-

Moore
Morrissey
Nantel
Nault
Oliver
Ouellette
Pauzé
Petitpas-Taylor
Picard
Poissant
Ramsey
Ratansi
Robillard
Rogers
Rudd
Sahota
Samson
Samson
Scarpaleggia
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Sorbara
Stetski
Tassi
Trudel
Vandenbeld
Virani
Whalen
Wilson-Raybould
Yip

PAIRED

Members

Graham
Ste-Marie

LeBlanc
Thériault — 4

The Speaker: I declare the motion defeated.

[*Translation*]

The next question is on Motion No. 223. A vote on this motion also applies to Motion No. 224.

● (1640)

(The House divided on Motion No. 223, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 702)

YEAS

Members

Aboultaif
Allison
Barlow
Bergen
Berthold
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Calkins
Chong
Cooper
Diotte
Dreeshen
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Fast
Gallant
Gemuis
Godin
Harder
Kelly
Kitchen
Kusie
Lauzon (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Lloyd
Lukiwski
McCauley (Edmonton West)
Motz
Nicholson
Obhrai
Poilievre
Reid
Saroya
Shields
Sorenson
Stubbs
Tilson
Van Kesteren
Vecchio
Wagantall
Waugh

Albrecht
Anderson
Benzen
Bernier
Bezan
Brassard
Carrie
Clarke
Dalhell
Doherty
Eglinski
Falk (Provencher)
Finley
Généreux
Gladu
Gourde
Jeneroux
Kent
Kmiec
Lake
Liepert
Lobb
MacKenzie
Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound)
Natter
Nuttall
Paul-Hus
Rayes
Richards
Schmale
Shipley
Strahl
Sweet
Trost
Van Loan
Viersen
Warkentin
Webber

Yeroglga 77

NAYS

Members

Aldag
Allesley
Angus
Arya
Ayoob
Bagnell
Baylis
Beech
Benson
Bittle
Blair
Boissonnault
Boudrias
Boutin-Sweet
Breton
Caesar-Chavannes
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Chagger
Choquette
Cullen
Dabrusin
Davies
Dhaliwal
Drouin
Dubourg
Duguid
Duncan (Edmonton—Strathcona)
Dzerowicz
El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith
Eyolfson
Finnigan
Fonseca
Fortin
Fraser (West Nova)
Fry
Garneau
Gerretsen
Goldsmith-Jones
Gould
Hardcastle
Hébert
Hogg
Hughes
Iacono
Jolibois
Jordan
Khalid
Lambropoulos
Lamoureux
Lavendière
Lefebvre
Levitt
Lockhart
Longfield
MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Maloney
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
Mathyssen
May (Cambridge)
McCrimmon
McGuinty
McKenna
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendicino
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Sœurs)
Monsef
Moore
Morrissey
Nantel
Nault
Oliver
Ouellette
Paradis
Petitpas Taylor
Picard
Poissant
Alghabra
Amos
Arseneault
Aubin
Badawey
Barsalou-Duval
Beaulieu
Bennett
Bibeau
Blaikie
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Bonin
Bonsant
Bratina
Brosseau
Cannings
Casey (Charlottetown)
Chen
Comuzzi
Cormier
Damoff
DeCourcey
Dhillon
Dubé
Duclos
Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Duvall
Ehsassi
Ellis
Eyking
Fillmore
Fisher
Fortier
Fragiskatos
Fraser (Central Nova)
Fuhr
Garrison
Gill
Goodale
Hajdu
Hardie
Hébert
Holland
Hutchings
Johns
Jody
Jowhari
Khera
Lametti
Lapointe (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Lebouthillier
Leslie
Lightbound
Long
Ludwig
MacGregor
Malcolmson
Marcil
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
McDonald
McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Mendès
Midzyluk
Morneau
Murray
Nassif
Ng
O'Regan
Paradis
Peschisolido
Philpott
Plamondon
Qualtrough
Ramsey
Rana
Robillard
Rogers
Rudd
Sahota
Samson
Sansoucy
Scarpaleggia
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Sorbara
Stetski
Tassi
Trudel
Vandenbeld
Virani
Whalen
Wilson-Raybould
Yip
Rankin
Rioux
Rodriguez
Romanado
Rota
Saini
Sangha
Sarai
Schulte
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Spengemann
Tan
Trudeau
Vandal
Vaughan
Weir
Wilkinson
Wrzesnewskyj
Young 196

PAIRED

Members

Graham
Ste-Marie
LeBlanc
Thériault 4

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 223 defeated. I therefore declare Motion No. 224 defeated.

[*English*]

The next question is on Motion No. 225. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 226 to 230.

● (1645)

(The House divided on Motion No 225, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 703)

YEAS

Members

Aboultaif
Allison
Barlow
Bergen
Berthold
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Calkins
Chong
Cooper
Diotte
Dreeshen
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Fast
Gallant
Genuis
Godin
Harder
Kelly
Kitchen
Kusie
Lauzon (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Lloyd
Lukiwski
McCauley (Edmonton West)
Motz
Nicholson
Obhrai
Poilievre
Reid
Saroya
Shields
Sorenson
Stubbs
Tilson
Albrecht
Anderson
Benzen
Bernier
Bezan
Brassard
Carrie
Clarke
Deltell
Doherty
Eglinski
Falk (Provencher)
Finley
Généreux
Gladu
Gourde
Jeneroux
Kent
Kmiec
Lake
Liepert
Lobb
MacKenzie
Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound)
Nater
Nuttall
Paul-Hus
Rayes
Richards
Schmale
Shipley
Strahl
Sweet
Trost

Van Kesteren — Van Loan
Vecchio — Viersen
Wagantall — Warkentin
Waugh — Webber
Wong — Yurdiga — 78

NAYS

Members

Aldag — Alghabra
Alleslev — Amos
Angus — Arya
Aubin — Ayoub
Badawey — Bagnell
Barsalou-Duval — Baylis
Beaudieu — Beech
Bennett — Benson
Bibeau — Bittle
Blaikie — Blair
Blaney (North Island — Powell River) — Boissonnault
Bossio — Boudrias
Boulerice — Boutin-Sweet
Bratina — Breton
Bronsseau — Caesar-Chavannes
Cannings — Casey (Cumberland — Colchester)
Casey (Charlottetown) — Chagger
Chen — Choquette
Cormier — Cullen
Cuzner — Dabrusin
Damoff — Davies
DeCourcey — Dhaliwal
Dhillon — Drouin
Dubé — Dubourg
Duclos — Duguid
Duncan (Etobicoke North) — Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)
Duvall — Dzerowicz
Ehassi — El-Khoury
Ellis — Erskine-Smith
Eyking — Eyolfson
Fillmore — Finnigan
Fisher — Fonseca
Fortier — Fortin
Fragiskatos — Fraser (West Nova)
Fraser (Central Nova) — Fry
Fuhr — Garneau
Garrison — Gerretsen
Gill — Goldsmith-Jones
Goodale — Gould
Hajdu — Hardcastle
Hardie — Hébert
Hehr — Hogg
Holland — Hughes
Hutchings — Iacono
Johns — Joly
Jordan — Joseph
Jowhari — Khalid
Khera — Lambropoulos
Lametti — Lamoureux
Lapointe — Lauzon (Argenteuil — La Petite Nation)
Laverdière — Lebouthillier
Lefebvre — Leslie
Levitt — Lightbound
Lockhart — Long
Longfield — Ludwig
MacAulay (Cardigan) — MacGregor
MacKinnon (Gatineau) — Malcolmson
Maloney — Marcil
Massé (Avignon — La Mitis — Matane — Matapédia) — Mathyssen
May (Cambridge) — May (Saanich — Gulf Islands)
McCrimmon — McDonald
McGuinty — McKay
McKenna — McKinnon (Coquitlam — Port Coquitlam)
McLeod (Northwest Territories) — Mendès
Mendicino — Mihychuk
Miller (Ville-Marie — Le Sud-Ouest — Île-des-Sœurs) — Monsef
Moore — Morneau
Morrissey — Murray
Nantel — Nault
Ng — Oliver
O'Regan — Ouellette
Paradis — Pauzé

Peschisolido — Petitpas Taylor
Philpott — Picard
Plamondon — Poissant
Qaqqaq — Qualtrough
Quach — Rankin
Ramsey — Rioux
Ratansi — Rodriguez
Robillard — Romanado
Rogers — Rota
Rudd — Rusnak
Saganash — Sahota
Samson — Sangha
Sansoucy — Sarai
Scarpaleggia — Schulte
Serré — Sgro
Shanahan — Sheehan
Sidhu (Mission — Matsqui — Fraser Canyon) — Sidhu (Brampton South)
Sikand — Simms
Sorbara — Spengemann
Stetski — Tan
Tassi — Trudeau
Trudel — Vandal
Vandenbeld — Vaughan
Virani — Whalen
Wilkinson — Wilson-Raybould
Wrzesnewskyj — Yip
Young — 195

PAIRED

Members

Graham — LeBlanc
Ste-Marie — Thériault — 4

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 225 defeated. I therefore declare Motions Nos. 226 to 230 defeated.

[*Translation*]

The question is on Motion No. 231. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 232 to 244.

● (1655)

(The House divided on Motion No. 231, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 704)

YEAS

Members

Aboultaif — Albrecht
Allison — Anderson
Barlow — Benzen
Bergen — Bernier
Berthold — Bezan
Blaney (Bellechasse — Les Etchemins — Lévis) — Brassard
Calkins — Carrie
Chong — Clarke
Cooper — Deltell
Diotte — Doherty
Dreeshen — Eglinski
Falk (Battlefords — Lloydminster) — Falk (Provencher)
Fast — Finley
Gallant — Généreux
Genuis — Gladu
Godin — Gourde
Harder — Jeneroux
Kelly — Kent
Kitchen — Kmiec
Kusie — Lake
Lauzon (Stormont — Dundas — South Glengarry) — Liepert
Lloyd — Lobb
Lukiwski — MacKenzie
McCauley (Edmonton West) — Miller (Bruce — Grey — Owen Sound)
Motz — Nater
Nicholson — Nuttall
Obhrai — Paul-Hus
Poilievre — Rayes
Reid — Richards
Saroya — Schmale

Shields
Sorenson
Strahl
Sweet
Trost
Van Loan
Viersen
Warkentin
Webber
Yurdiga 79

Shipley
Stanton
Stubbs
Tilson
Van Kesteren
Vecchio
Wagantall
Waugh
Wong

NAYS

Members

Abbg
Alleslev
Angus
Arya
Ayoub
Bagnell
Baylis
Beech
Benson
Battle
Blair
Boissonnault
Boudrias
Boutin-Sweet
Breton
Caesar-Chavannes
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Chagger
Choquette
Cullen
Dabrusin
Davies
Dhaliwal
Drouin
Dubourg
Dugid
Duncan (Edmonton—Strathcona)
Dzerowicz
El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith
Fillmore
Fisher
Fortier
Fragiskatos
Fraser (Central Nova)
Fuhr
Garrison
Gill
Goodale
Hajdu
Hardie
Hehr
Holland
Hutchings
Johns
Joly
Jowhari
Khera
Lametti
Lapointe
Levesque
Lefebvre
Levitt
Lockhart
Longfield
MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Maloney
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
Mathyssen
May (Cambridge)
McCrimmon
McGuinty
McKenna
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendicino
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Soeurs)
Monsef
Moore

Alghabra
Amos
Arseneault
Aubin
Badawey
Barsalou-Duval
Beaulieu
Bennett
Bibeau
Blaikie
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Bossio
Boulerice
Bratina
Brosseau
Cannings
Casey (Charlottetown)
Chen
Cormier
Cuzner
Dancoff
DeCourcey
Dhillon
Dubé
Ducks
Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Duvall
Eglinski
Ellis
Eyking
Finnigan
Fonseca
Fortin
Fraser (West Nova)
Fry
Garneau
Gerretsen
Goldsmith-Jones
Gould
Hardcastle
Hébert
Hogg
Hughes
Iacono
Jolibois
Jordan
Khalid
Lambropoulos
Lamoureux
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Lebouthillier
Leslie
Lightbound
Long
Ludwig
MacGregor
Malcolmson
Marcil

May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
McDonald
McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Mendès
Mihychuk

Morneau
Morrissey
Nantel
Ng
O'Regan
Paradis
Petitpas Taylor
Picard
Poissant
Qualtrough
Rankin
Rioux
Rodriguez
Romanado
Rota
Saini
Sangha
Sarai
Schulte
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Spengemann
Tan
Tootoo
Vandal
Vaughan
Wee
Wilkinson
Wrzesnewskyj
Young 195

Murray
Nault
Oliver
Ouellette
Peterl
Philpott
Plamondon
Quach
Ramsey
Rotasti
Rebillard
Rogers
Rudd
Saholta
Samson
Sansoucy
Scarpaleggia
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Sorbara
Stetski
Tassi
Trudel
Vandenbeld
Virani
Whalen
Wilson-Raybould
Yip

PAIRED

Members

Graham
Ste-Marie

Leitão
Thériault 4

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 231 defeated. I therefore declare Motions Nos. 232 to 244 defeated.

[*English*]

The next question is on Motion No. 245. The vote on this motion also applies to Motion No. 246.

● (1700)

(The House divided on Motion No. 245, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 705)

YEAS

Members

Aboultaif
Allison
Barlow
Bergen
Berthold
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Calkins
Chong
Cooper
Diotte
Dreeshen
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Fast
Gallant
Genuis
Godin
Harder
Kelly
Kitchen
Kmiec
Lauzon (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Lloyd
Lukiwski
McCauley (Edmonton West)
Motz

Albrecht
Anderson
Benson
Bernier
Bezan
Brassard
Carrie
Clarke
Deltell
Doherty
Eglinski
Falk (Provencher)
Finley
Generoux
Gladu
Gourde
Jeneroux
Kent
Kmiec
Lake
Liepert
Lobb
MacKenzie
Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound)
Nater

Nicholson
Paul-Hus
Rayes
Richards
Schmale
Shipley
Stanton
Stubbs
Tilson
Van Kesteren
Vecchio
Waugh
Wong

Albas
Albrecht
Anand
Arya
Ayoub
Bagnell
Beech
Benson
Bittle
Blair
Boissonnault
Bradshaw
Breton Sweet
Bylsma
Cuzner Charamine
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Chagger
Choquette
Cullen
Dabrusin
Davies
Dhaliwal
Dubé
Duclos
Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Duvall
Ehsassi
Ellis
Eyking
Fillmore
Fisher
Fortier
Fragiskatos
Fraser (Central Nova)
Fuhr
Garrison
Gill
Goodale
Hajdu
Hardie
Hehr
Hughes
Iacono
Jaffer
Jordan
Khalid
Lambropoulos
Lametti
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Lebouthillier
Leslie
Lightbound
Long
Ludwig
MacGregor
Mahoney
Maloney
Mathyssen
May (Cambridge)
McCrimmon
McGinty
McKenna
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendicino

Oliphant
Paradis
Perkins
Philpott
Picard
Poissant
Qualtrough
Rankin
Rioux
Rodriguez
Romanado
Rusnak
Saini
Sangha
Sarai
Schulte
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Spengemann
Tan
Tassi
Vandenbeld
Virani
Weir
Wilkinson
Wrzesnewskyj
Young

Abbott
Poilievre
Reid
Saroya
Shields
Sorenson
Strahl
Sweet
Trost
Van Loan
Vidsen
Warkentin
Webber
Yurdiga

Aldag
Amos
Arseneault
Ashton
Badawey
Barsalou-Duval
Beaulieu
Bennett
Bibeau
Blaikie
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Bossio
Boudrias
Brahmi
Brosseau
Cannings
Casey (Charlottetown)
Chen
Cormier
Currie
Damoff
DeCourcey
Desilets
Dubourg
Dugrud
Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)
Dzerowicz
El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith
Eyolfson
Finnigan
Fonseca
Fortin
Fraser (West Nova)
Fry
Garneau
Gerretsen
Goldsmith-Jones
Gould
Hardcastle
Hébert
Hogg
Hutchings
Johns
Joly
Jowhari
Khera
Lametti
Lapointe
Lavallée
Lefebvre
Levitt
Lockhart
Longfield
MacAulay (Cardigan)
Malcolmson
Marcil

May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
McDonald
McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Mendès
Mihychuk

Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Sœurs)
Monsef
Moore
Morrissey
Nuttall
Nault
Oliver
Ouellette
Paent
Peschisolido
Philpott
Plamondon
Quach
Ramsey
Rotaire
Robillard
Rogers
Rudd
Saliohi
Samson
Sansoucy
Scarpaleggia
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Sorbara
Stetski
Tassi
Trudel
Vandenbeld
Virani
Whalen
Wilson-Raybould
Yip

Graham
Ste-Marie

LeBlanc
Thériault

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 245 defeated. I therefore declare Motion No. 246 defeated.

The next question is on Motion No. 247. The vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 248 and 249.

● (1710)

[*Translation*]

(The House divided on Motion No. 247, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 706)

Abeudaf
Allison
Barlow
Bergen
Berthold
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Calkins
Chong
Cooper
Diotte
Dreeshen
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Fast
Gallant
Genuis
Godin
Hanke
Kelly
Kitchen
Kmiec
Lauzon (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)

Albrecht
Anderson
Benzen
Bernier
Bezan
Brassard
Carrie
Clarke
Dechert
Doherty
Eglinski
Falk (Provencher)
Finley
Genuis
Gladu
Gourde
Jameson
Kent
Kmiec
Lake
Lemieux

Lloyd	Lobb
Lukiwski	McCauley (Edmonton West)
Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound)	Motz
Nater	Nicholson
Obhrai	Paul-Hus
Poilievre	Rayes
Reid	Richards
Saroya	Schmale
Shields	Shipley
Sorenson	Strahl
Stubbs	Sweet
Tilson	Trost
Van Kesteren	Van Loan
Vecchio	Viersen
Wagantall	Warkentin
Waugh	Webber
Wong	Yurdiga — 76

NAYS

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Allesley	Amos
Angus	Arseneault
Arya	Aubin
Ayoub	Badawey
Bagnell	Barsalou-Duval
Baylis	Beaulieu
Beech	Bennett
Benson	Bibeau
Bittle	Blaikie
Blair	Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Boissonnault	Bossio
Boudrias	Boulerice
Boutin-Sweet	Bratina
Breton	Brosseau
Caesar-Chavannes	Cannings
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)	Casey (Charlottetown)
Chagger	Chen
Choquette	Cormier
Cullen	Cuzner
Dabrusin	Damoff
Davies	DeCourcey
Dhaliwal	Dhillon
Drouin	Dubé
Dubourg	Duclos
Duguid	Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Duncan (Edmonton—Strathcona)	Dzerowicz
Ehsassi	El-Khoury
Ellis	Erskine-Smith
Eyking	Eyolfson
Fillmore	Finnigan
Fisher	Fonseca
Fortier	Fortin
Fragiskatos	Fraser (West Nova)
Fraser (Central Nova)	Fry
Fuhr	Garneau
Garrison	Gerretsen
Gill	Goldsmith-Jones
Goodale	Gould
Hajdu	Hardcastle
Hardie	Hébert
Hehr	Hogg
Holland	Hughes
Hutchings	Iacono
Johns	Jolibois
Joly	Jordan
Jowhari	Khera
Lambropoulos	Lametti
Lamoureux	Lapointe
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)	Laverdière
Lebouthillier	Lefebvre
Leslie	Levitt
Lightbound	Lockhart
Long	Longfield
Ludwig	MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacGregor	MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Malcolmson	Maloney
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)	
Mathyssen	
May (Cambridge)	May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
McCrimmon	McDonald
McGuinty	McKay
McKenna	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLeod (Northwest Territories)	Mendès
Mendicino	Mihychuk
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Sœurs)	
Monsef	
Morneau	Morrissey
Murray	Nantel
Nassif	Nault
Ng	Oliver
O'Regan	Ouellette
Paradis	Pauzé
Peschisolido	Petitpas Taylor
Philpott	Picard
Plamondon	Poissant
Quach	Qualtrough
Ramsey	Rankin
Ratansi	Rioux
Robillard	Rodriguez
Rogers	Romanado
Rudd	Ruimy
Sahota	Saini
Samson	Sangha
Sansoucy	Sarai
Scarpaleggia	Schulte
Serré	Sgro
Shanahan	Sheehan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)	Sidhu (Brampton South)
Sikand	Simms
Sorbara	Spengemann
Stetski	Tan
Tassi	Trudeau
Trudel	Vandal
Vandenbeld	Vaughan
Virani	Weir
Whalen	Wilkinson
Wilson-Raybould	Wrzesnewskyj
Yip	Young — 144

PAIRED

Members

Graham	Lefebvre
Ste-Marie	Thériault — 4

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 247 defeated. I therefore declare Motions Nos. 248 and 249 defeated.

[*English*]

The question is on Motion No. 250. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 251 to 256.

● (1715)

(The House divided on Motion No. 250, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 707)

YEAS

Members

Aboultaif	Albrecht
Allison	Anderson
Barlow	Benzen
Bergen	Bernier
Berthold	Bezan
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Levis)	Brassard
Calkins	Carrie
Chong	Clarke
Clement	Cooper
Deltell	Diotte
Doherty	Dreeshen
Eglinski	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Falk (Provencher)	Fast
Finley	Gallant
Genereux	Genuis
Gladu	Godin
Gourde	Harder
Jeneroux	Kelly
Kent	Kitchen

Kmiec
Lake
Liepert
Lobb
MacKenzie
Motz
Nicholson
Obhrai
Poilievre
Reid
Saroya
Shields
Sorenson
Sweet
Trost
Van Loan
Viersen
Warkentin
Webber
Yurdiga 77

Kusie
Lauzon (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Lloyd
Lukiwski
McCauley (Edmonton West)
Nater
Nuttall
Paul-Hus
Rayes
Richards
Schmale
Shipley
Stubbs
Tilson
Van Kesteren
Vecchio
Wagantall
Waugh
Wong

NAYS

Members

Aldag
Alleslev
Angus
Arya
Ayoub
Bagnell
Baylis
Beech
Benson
Bittle
Blair
Boissonnault
Boudrias
Boutin-Sweet
Breton
Cannings
Casey (Charlottetown)
Choquette
Cullen
Dabrusin
Davies
Dhaliwal
Drouin
Dubourg
Duguid
Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)
Dzerowicz
El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith
Eyolfson
Finnigan
Fonseca
Fortin
Fraser (West Nova)
Fry
Garrison
Goldsmith-Jones
Gould
Hardcastle
Hébert
Hogg
Hughes
Iacono
Jolibois
Jordan
Khalid
Lambropoulos
Lamoureux
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Lefebvre
Levitt
Lockhart
Longfield
MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Maloney
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
Mathyssen
May (Cambridge)

Alghabra
Amos
Arseneault
Aubin
Badawey
Barsalou-Duval
Beaulieu
Bennett
Bibeau
Blaikie
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Bossio
Boulerice
Bratina
Caesar-Chavannes
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Chagger
Cormier
Cuzner
Damoff
DeCourcey
Dhillon
Dubé
Duclos
Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Duvall
Ehsassi
Ellis
Eyking
Fillmore
Fisher
Fortier
Fragiskatos
Fraser (Central Nova)
Garneau
Gerretsen
Goodale
Hajdu
Hardie
Hehr
Holland
Hutchings
Johns
Joly
Jowhari
Khera
Lametti
Lapointe
Lebouthillier
Leslie
Lightbound
Long
Ludwig
MacGregor
Malcolmson
Mendès
Mihychuk

May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)

McCrimmon
McGuinty
McKenna
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendicino
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Sœurs)
Monsef
Moore
Morrissey
Nantel
Nault
Oliver
Ouellette
Pauzé
Petitpas Taylor
Picard
Poissant
Quadrough
Rankin
Rioux
Rodriguez
Romanado
Sahota
Samson
Sansoucy
Scarpaleggia
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Sorbara
Stetski
Tassi
Trudel
Vandenbeld
Virani
Whalen
Wilson-Raybould
Yip

McDonald
McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Mendès
Mihychuk
Moreau
Murray
Nassif
Ng
O'Regan
Paradis
Peschisolido
Philpott
Plamondon
Quach
Ramsey
Ratansi
Robillard
Rogers
Ruimy
Saini
Sangha
Sarai
Schulte
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Spengemann
Tan
Trudeau
Vandal
Vaughan
Weir
Wilkinson
Wrzesnewsky)
Young 192

PAIRED

Members

Graham
Ste-Marie

LeBlanc
Therrault 4

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 250 defeated. I therefore declare Motions Nos. 251 to 256 also defeated.

[*Translation*]

The question is on Motion No. 257. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 258 to 264.

● (1725)

(The House divided on Motion No. 257, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 708)

YEAS

Members

Aboultaif
Allison
Barlow
Bergen
Berthold
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Calkins
Chong
Clement
Deltell
Doherty
Eglinski
Falk (Provencher)
Finley
Genereux
Gladu
Gourde

Albrecht
Anderson
Benzen
Bernier
Bezan
Brassard
Carrie
Clarke
Cooper
Diotte
Dreeshen
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Fast
Gallant
Genuis
Godin
Harder

Jeneroux
Kent
Kmiec
Lake
Liepert
Lobb
MacKenzie
Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound)
Nater
Nuttall
Paul-Hus
Rayes
Saroya
Shields
Sorenson
Stubbs
Tilson
Van Kesteren
Vecchio
Wagantall
Webber
Yurdiga — 77

Kelly
Kitchen
Kusie
Lauzon (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Lloyd
Lukiwski
McCauley (Edmonton West)
Motz
Nicholson
Obhrai
Poilievre
Richards
Schmale
Shipley
Strahl
Sweet
Trost
Van Loan
Viersen
Waugh
Wong

NAYS

Members

Aldag
Alleslev
Angus
Arya
Ayoub
Bagnell
Baylis
Bennett
Bibeau
Blaikie
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Bossio
Boulerice
Bratina
Caesar-Chavannes
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Chagger
Cormier
Cuzner
Damoff
DeCourcey
Dhillon
Dubé
Duclos
Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Duvall
Ehsassi
Ellis
Eyking
Fillmore
Fisher
Fortier
Fraser (West Nova)
Fry
Gameau
Gerretsen
Goldsmith-Jones
Gould
Hardcastle
Hebert
Hogg
Hughes
Iacono
Jolibois
Jordan
Khalid
Lambropoulos
Lamoureux
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Lefebvre
Levitt
Lockhart
Longfield
MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Maloney

Alghabra
Amos
Arseneault
Aubin
Badawey
Barsalou-Duval
Beaulieu
Benson
Bittle
Blair
Boissonnault
Boudrias
Boutin-Sweet
Breton
Cannings
Casey (Charlottetown)
Chen
Cullen
Dabrusin
Davies
Dhaliwal
Drouin
Dubourg
Duguid
Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)
Dzerowicz
El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith
Eyolfson
Finnigan
Fonseca
Fragiskatos
Fraser (Central Nova)
Fuhr
Garrison
Gill
Goodale
Hajdu
Hardie
Hehr
Holland
Hutchings
Johns
Joly
Jowhari
Khera
Lametti
Lapointe
Lebouthillier
Leslie
Lightbound
Long
Ludwig
MacGregor
Malcolmson
Marcil

Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
Mathyssen
May (Cambridge)
McCrimmon
McGuinty
McKenna
Mendès
Mihychuk
Soeurs)
Monsef
Morneau
Murray
Nassif
Ng
O'Regan
Paradis
Peschisolido
Philpott
Poissant
Qualtrough
Rankin
Rioux
Rodriguez
Romanado
Rumny
Saini
Sangha
Sarai
Schulte
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Spengemann
Tan
Trudeau
Vandal
Vaughan
Weir
Wilkinson
Wrzesnewsky)
Young — 191

May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
McDonald
McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Mendicino
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île des

Moore
Morrissey
Nantel
Nault
Oliver
Ouellette
Pauze
Petitpas Taylor
Plamondon
Quach
Ramsey
Ratansi
Robillard
Rogers
Rudd
Sahota
Samson
Samsouey
Scarpaleggia
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Sorbara
Stetski
Tassi
Trudel
Vandenbeld
Virani
Whalen
Wilson-Raybould
Yip

PAIRED

Members

Graham
Ste Marie

LeBlanc
Thériault — 4

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 257 defeated. I therefore declare Motions Nos. 258 to 264 defeated.

[*English*]

The next question is on Motion No. 265. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 266 and 267.

● (1730)

(The House divided on Motion No. 265, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 709)

YEAS

Members

Aboultaif
Allison
Barlow
Bernier
Bezan
Brassard
Carrie
Clement
Deltell
Doherty
Eglinski
Falk (Provencher)
Finley
Genereux

Albrecht
Anderson
Benzen
Berthold
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Calkins
Clarke
Cooper
Diotte
Dreeshen
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Fast
Gallant
Gerrus

Gladu
Godin
Gourde
Harder
Jeneroux
Kelly
Kent
Kitchen
Kmiec
Kusie
Lake
Lauzon (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Liepert
Lloyd
Lobb
Lukiwski
MacKenzie
McCauley (Edmonton West)
Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound)
Motz
Nater
Nicholson
Nuttall
Obhrai
Paul-Hus
Poilievre
Rayes
Reid
Richards
Saroya
Schmale
Shipley
Sorenson
Strahl
Stubbs
Sweet
Tilson
Trost
Van Kesteren
Van Loan
Vecchio
Viersen
Wagantall
Warkentin
Waugh
Webber
Wong
Yurdiga — 76

NAYS

Members

Aldag
Alghabra
Alleslev
Amos
Angus
Arseneault
Arya
Aubin
Ayoub
Badawey
Bagnell
Barsalou-Duval
Baylis
Beaulieu
Beech
Bennett
Bernier
Bibeau
Bittle
Blaikie
Blair
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Boissonnault
Bossio
Boudrias
Boulerice
Boutin-Sweet
Bratina
Breton
Brosseau
Caesar-Chavannes
Cannings
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Casey (Charlottetown)
Chagger
Chen
Choquette
Cormier
Cullen
Cuzner
Dabrusin
Damoff
Davies
DeCourcey
Dhaliwal
Dhillon
Drouin
Dubé
Dubourg
Duclos
Duguid
Duncan (Edmonton—Strathcona)
Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Dzerowicz
Duvall
El-Khoury
Ehsassi
Erskine-Smith
Ellis
Eyolfson
Eyking
Finnigan
Fillmore
Fonseca
Fisher
Fortin
Fortier
Fraser (West Nova)
Fragiskatos
Fry
Fraser (Central Nova)
Garneau
Fuhr
Gerretsen
Garrison
Goodale
Goldsmith-Jones
Hajdu
Gould
Hardie
Hardcastle
Hehr
Hébert
Holland
Hogg
Hutchings
Hughes
Iacono
Johns
Jolibois
Jordan
Jowhari
Khalid
Khera
Lambropoulos
Lametti
Lamoureux
Lapointe
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Laverdière
Lebouthillier
Lefebvre
Leslie
Levitt
Lightbound
Lockhart
Long
Longfield
Ludwig
MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacGregor
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Malcolmson
Maloney
Marcil
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
Mathyssen
May (Cambridge)
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
McCrimmon
McDonald
McGuinty
McKay
McKenna
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendès
Mendicino
Mihychuk
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Soeurs)
Monsef
Moore
Morneau
Morrissey
Murray
Nantel
Nassif
Nault
Ng
Oliver
O'Regan
Ouellette
Paradis
Pauzé
Peschisolido
Petitpas Taylor
Philpott
Picard
Plamondon
Poissant
Quach
Qualtrough
Ramsey
Rankin
Ratansi
Rioux
Robillard
Rodriguez
Rogers
Romanado
Rota
Rudd
Ruimy
Sahota
Saini
Samson
Sangha
Sansoucy
Sarai
Scarpaleggia
Schulte
Serré
Sgro
Shanahan
Sheehan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Sikand
Simms
Sorbara
Spengemann
Stetski
Tan
Tassi
Trudeau
Trudel
Vandal
Vandenbeld
Vaughan
Virani
Weir
Whalen
Wilkinson
Wilson-Raybould
Wrzesnewskyj
Yip
Young — 197

PAIRED

Members

Graham — LeBlanc
Ste-Marie — Thériault — 4

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 265 defeated. I therefore declare Motions Nos. 266 and 267 also defeated.

[Translation]

The question is on Motion No. 268. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 269 to 283.

● (1740)

(The House divided on Motion No. 268, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 710)

YEAS

Members

Aboultaif
Albrecht
Allison
Anderson
Barlow
Benzen
Bergen
Bernier
Berthold
Bezan
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Levis)
Brassard
Calkins
Carrie
Chong
Clarke
Clement
Cooper
Deltell
Diotte
Doherty
Dreeshen

Eglinski
Fast
Gallant
Gemis
Godin
Harder
Kelly
Kitchen
Kusie
Liepert
Lobb
MacKenzie
Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound)
Nater
Nuttall
Paul-Hus
Rayes
Richards
Schmale
Shipley
Strahl
Sweet
Trost
Van Loan
Viersen
Warkentin
Webber
Yurdiga — 77

Falk (Provencher)
Finley
Généreux
Gladu
Gourde
Jeneroux
Kent
Kmiec
Lake
Lloyd
Lukiwski
McCauley (Edmonton West)
Motz
Nicholson
Obhrai
Poilievre
Reid
Saroya
Shields
Sorenson
Stubbs
Tilson
Van Kesteren
Vecchio
Wagantall
Waugh
Wong

NAYS

Members

Aldag
Allesley
Angus
Arya
Ayoub
Bagnell
Baylis
Beech
Benson
Bittle
Blair
Boissonnault
Boudrias
Boutin-Sweet
Breton
Caesar-Chavannes
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Chen
Cormier
Cuzner
Damoff
DeCourcey
Dhillon
Dubé
Duclos
Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Duvall
Ehsassi
Ellis
Eyking
Fillmore
Fisher
Fortier
Fragiskatos
Fraser (Central Nova)
Fuhr
Garrison
Gill
Goodale
Hardcastle
Hébert
Hogg
Hughes
Iacono
Jolibois
Jowhari
Khera
Lametti
Lapointe
Laverdière
Lefebvre

Alghabra
Amos
Arseneault
Aubin
Badawey
Barsalou-Duval
Beaulieu
Bennett
Bibeau
Blaikie
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Bossio
Boulerice
Bratina
Brosseau
Cannings
Casey (Charlottetown)
Choquette
Cullen
Dabrusin
Davies
Dhaliwal
Drouin
Dubourg
Duguid
Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)
Dzerowicz
El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith
Eyolfson
Finnigan
Fonseca
Fortin
Fraser (West Nova)
Fry
Garneau
Gerretsen
Goldsmith-Jones
Hajdu
Hardie
Hehr
Holland
Hutchings
Johns
Jordan
Khalid
Lambropoulos
Lamoureux
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Lebouthillier
Levitt

Lightbound
Long
Ludwig
MacGregor
Malcolmson
Marcil
Mathyssen
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
McDonald
McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Mendès
Mihychuk
Soeurs)
Monsef
Morneau
Murray
Nassif
Ng
O'Regan
Paradis
Petitpas Taylor
Picard
Poissant
Qualtrough
Rankin
Rioux
Rodriguez
Romanado
Rudd
Sahota
Samson
Sansoucy
Scarpaleggia
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Sorbara
Stetski
Tassi
Trudel
Vandenbeld
Virani
Whalen
Wrzesnewskyj
Young — 193

Lockhart
Longfield
MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Maloney
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
May (Cambridge)
McCrimmon
McGuinty
McKenna
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendicino
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-

Moore
Morrissey
Nantel
Nault
Oliver
Ouellette
Peschisolido
Philpott
Plamondon
Quach
Ramsey
Ratansi
Robillard
Rogers
Rota
Ruimy
Saini
Sangha
Sarai
Schulte
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Spengemann
Tan
Trudeau
Vandal
Vaughan
Weir
Wilkinson
Yip

PAIRED

Members

Graham
Ste-Marie

LeBlanc
Thériault — 4

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 268 defeated. I therefore declare Motions Nos. 269 to 283 defeated.

[*English*]

The next question is on Motion No. 284. The vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 285 to 296.

● (1745)

(The House divided on Motion No. 284, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 711)

YEAS

Members

Aboultaif
Allison
Barlow
Bergen
Berthold
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Calkins
Chong
Clement

Albrecht
Anderson
Benzen
Bernier
Bezan
Brassard
Carrie
Clarke
Cooper

Deltell
Dreeshen
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Fast
Gallant
Genuis
Godin
Harder
Kelly
Kitchen
Kusie
Lauzon (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Lobb
MacKenzie
Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound)
Nater
Nuttall
Paul-Hus
Rayes
Richards
Schmale
Shipley
Strahl
Tilson
Van Kesteren
Vecchio
Waugantall
Waugh
Wong

Diotte
Eglinski
Falk (Provencher)
Finley
Généreux
Gladu
Gourde
Jeneroux
Kent
Kmiec
Lake
Lloyd
Lukiwski
McCauley (Edmonton West)
Motz
Nicholson
Obhrai
Poilievre
Reid
Saroya
Shields
Sorenson
Sweet
Trost
Van Loan
Viersen
Warkentin
Webber
Yurdiga — 76

NAYS

Members

Aldag
Alleslev
Angus
Arya
Ayoub
Bagnell
Barsalou-Duval
Beaulieu
Bennett
Bibeau
Blaikie
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Bossio
Boulerice
Bratina
Caesar-Chavannes
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Chen
Cormier
Dabrusin
Davies
Dhaliwal
Drouin
Dubourg
Duguid
Duncan (Edmonton—Strathcona)
Dzerowicz
El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith
Eyolfson
Finnigan
Fonseca
Fortin
Fraser (West Nova)
Fry
Garneau
Gerretsen
Goldsmith-Jones
Hajdu
Hardie
Hehr
Holland
Hutchings
Johns
Joly
Jowhari
Khera
Lametti
Lapointe
Laverdière

Alghabra
Amos
Arseneault
Aubin
Badawey
Bains
Baylis
Beech
Benson
Bittle
Blair
Boissonnault
Boudrias
Boutin-Sweet
Brosseau
Cannings
Casey (Charlottetown)
Choquette
Cuzner
Damoff
DeCourcey
Dhillon
Dubé
Duclos
Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Duvall
Ehsassi
Ellis
Eyking
Fillmore
Fisher
Fortier
Fragiskatos
Fraser (Central Nova)
Fuhr
Garrison
Gill
Goodale
Hardcastle
Hébert
Hogg
Hughes
Iacono
Jolibois
Jordan
Khalid
Lambropoulos
Lamoureux
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Lebouthillier

Lefebvre
Lightbound
Long
Ludwig
MacGregor
Malcolmson
Marcil
Mathyssen
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
McDonald
McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Mendès
Mihychuk
Soeurs)
Moore
Morrissey
Nantel
Nault
Oliver
Ouellette
Pauzé
Petitpas Taylor
Picard
Poissant
Qualtrough
Rankin
Rioux
Rodriguez
Romanado
Rudd
Sahota
Samson
Sansoucy
Scarpaleggia
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Sorbara
Stetski
Tassi
Trudel
Vandenbeld
Virani
Whalen
Wrzesnewskyj
Young — 193

Levitt
Lockhart
Longfield
MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Maloney
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
May (Cambridge)
McCrimmon
McGuinty
McKenna
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendicino
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-

Morneau
Murray
Nassif
Ng
O'Regan
Paradis
Peschisolido
Philpott
Plamondon
Quach
Ramsey
Ratansi
Robillard
Rogers
Rota
Ruimy
Saini
Sangha
Sarai
Schulte
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Spengemann
Tan
Trudeau
Vandal
Vaughan
Weir
Wilkinson
Yip

PAIRED

Members

Graham
Ste-Marie

LeBlanc
Thériault — 4

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 284 defeated. I therefore declare Motions Nos. 285 to 296 also defeated.

As a reminder to all hon. members, in accordance with our Standing Orders and conventions, when members stand to be recognized for voting, the dress minimum is, of course, modern business attire for men. That means, at a minimum, wearing a jacket. I would ask members to take note of that.

[*Translation*]

The question is on Motion No. 297. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 298 to 309.

● (1755)

(The House divided on Motion No. 297, which was negatived on the following division:)

Government Orders

(Division No. 712)

YEAS

Members

Aboultaif
Allison
Barlow
Bergen
Berthold
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Calkins
Chong
Clement
Deltell
Dreeshen
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Fast
Gallant
Genuis
Godin
Harder
Kelly
Kitchen
Lake
Lloyd
Lukiwski
McCauley (Edmonton West)
Motz
Nicholson
Obhrai
Poilievre
Reid
Saroya
Shields
Sorenson
Sweet
Trost
Van Loan
Viersen
Warkentin
Webber
Yurdiga — 75

Albrecht
Anderson
Benzen
Bernier
Bezan
Boissonnault
Carrie
Clarke
Cooper
Diotte
Eglinski
Falk (Provencher)
Finley
Généreux
Gladu
Gourde
Jeneroux
Kent
Kmiec
Lauzon (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Lobb
MacKenzie
Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound)
Nater
Nuttall
Paul-Hus
Rayes
Richards
Schmale
Shipley
Strahl
Tilson
Van Kesteren
Vecchio
Wagantall
Waugh
Wong

NAYS

Members

Aldag
Alleslev
Arseneault
Aubin
Badawey
Bains
Baylis
Beech
Benson
Battle
Blair
Boissonnault
Boudrias
Boutin-Sweet
Breton
Caesar-Chavannes
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Chagger
Choquette
Cuzner
Damoff
DeCourcey
Dhillon
Dubé
Duclos
Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Duvall
Ehsassi
Ellis
Eyking
Fillmore
Fisher
Fortier
Fragiskatos
Fraser (Central Nova)

Alghabra
Amos
Arya
Ayoub
Bagnell
Barsalou-Duval
Beaulieu
Bennett
Bibeau
Blaikie
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Bossio
Boulerice
Bratina
Brosseau
Cannings
Casey (Charlottetown)
Chen
Cormier
Dabrusin
Davies
Dhaliwal
Drouin
Dubourg
Duguid
Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)
Dzerowicz
El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith
Eyolfson
Finnigan
Fonseca
Fortin
Fraser (West Nova)
Fry

Fuhr
Garrison
Gill
Goodale
Hardcastle
Hébert
Hogg
Hughes
Johns
Joly
Jowhari
Khera
Lametti
Lapointe
Laverdière
Lefebvre
Levitt
Lockhart
Longfield
MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Maloney
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
Mathyssen
May (Cambridge)
McCrimmon
McGuinty
McKenna
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendicino
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Sœurs)
Monsef
Moore
Morrissey
Nantel
Nault
Oliver
Ouellette
Pauzé
Pettipas Taylor
Picard
Poissant
Qualtrough
Rankin
Robillard
Rogers
Rota
Ruimy
Saini
Sangha
Sarai
Schulte
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Spengemann
Tan
Trudeau
Vandal
Vaughan
Weir
Wilkinson
Wrzesnewskyj
Young — 195

Garneau
Gerretsen
Goldsmith-Jones
Hajdu
Hardie
Hehr
Holland
Hutchings
Jolibois
Jordan
Khalid
Lambropoulos
Lamoureux
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Lebouthillier
Leslie
Lightbound
Long
Ludwig
MacGregor
Malcolmson
Marcil
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
McDonald
McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Mendès
Mihychuk
Morneau
Murray
Nassif
Ng
O'Regan
Paradis
Peschisolido
Philpott
Plamondon
Quach
Ramsey
Rioux
Rodriguez
Romanado
Rudd
Sahota
Samson
Sansoucy
Scarpaleggia
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Sorbara
Stetski
Tassi
Tradel
Vandenbeld
Virani
Whalen
Wilson-Raybould
Yip

PAIRED

Members

Graham
Ste-Marie

LeBlanc
Thériault — 4

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 297 defeated. I therefore declare Motions Nos. 298 to 309 defeated.

[*English*]

The next question is on Motion No. 310. The vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 316, 317, 324, and 329.

● (1805)

(The House divided on Motion No. 310, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 713)

YEAS

Members

Aboultaif
Allison
Aubin
Benson
Bergen
Berthold
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Boudrias
Brassard
Calkins
Carrie
Choquette
Clement
Davies
Diotte
Dubé
Duvall
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Fast
Généreux
Gladu
Gourde
Harder
Jeneroux
Jolibois
Kent
Kmiec
Lake
Laverdière
Lloyd
MacGregor
Malcolmson
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound)
Nantel
Nicholson
Obhrai
Quach
Rankin
Reid
Sansoucy
Schmale
Shipley
Stetski
Stubbs
Tilson
Trudel
Van Loan
Viersen
Warawa
Waugh
Weir
Yurdiga — 105

Albrecht
Anderson
Barlow
Benzen
Bernier
Blaikie
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Boutin-Sweet
Brosseau
Cannings
Chong
Clarke
Cooper
Dehell
Dreeshen
Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)
Eglinski
Falk (Provencher)
Garrison
Gennis
Godin
Hardcastle
Hughes
Johns
Kelly
Kitchen
Kusie
Lauzon (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Liepert
Lukiwski
MacKenzie
Mathyssen
McCauley (Edmonton West)
Moore
Nater
Nuttall
Poilievre
Ramsey
Rayes
Richards
Saroya
Shields
Sorenson
Strahl
Sweet
Trost
Van Kesteren
Vecchio
Wagantall
Warkentin
Webber
Wong

NAYS

Members

Aldag
Alleslev
Arseneault
Ayoub
Bagnell
Barsalou-Duval
Beaulieu
Bennett
Bittle
Boissonnault
Boudrias
Breton
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Chagger

Alghabra
Amos
Arya
Badawey
Bains
Baylis
Beech
Bibeau
Blair
Bossio
Bratina
Caesar-Chavannes
Casey (Charlottetown)
Chen
Cormier
Dabrusin
DeCourcey
Dhillon
Dubourg
Duguid
Ehsassi
Ellis
Eyking
Fillmore
Fisher
Fortier
Fragiskatos
Fraser (Central Nova)
Fuhr
Gerretsen
Goldsmith-Jones
Gould
Hardie
Hehr
Holland
Iacono
Jordan
Khalid
Lambropoulos
Lamoureux
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Lefebvre
Levitt
Lockhart
Longfield
MacAulay (Cardigan)
Maloney
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
May (Cambridge)
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
McDonald
McKenna
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendicino
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Sœurs)
Monsef
Morneau
Murray
Nault
O'Regan
Paradis
Peschisolido
Philpott
Plamondon
Qualtrough
Rioux
Rodriguez
Romanado
Rudd
Sahota
Samson
Sarai
Schulte
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Spengemann
Tassi
Vandal
Vaughan
Whalen
Wilson-Raybould
Yip

Cuzner
Damoff
Dhaliwal
Drouin
Ducks
Duncan (Etobicoke North)
El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith
Eyolfson
Finnigan
Fonseca
Fortin
Fraser (West Nova)
Fry
Garneau
Gill
Goodale
Hajdu
Hébert
Hogg
Hutchings
Joly
Jowhari
Khera
Lametti
Lapointe
Lebouthillier
Leslie
Lightbound
Long
Ludwig
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Marcil

McCrimmon
McGuinty
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Mendès
Mihychuk

Morrissey
Nassif
Oliver
Ouellette
Pauzé
Petitpas Taylor
Picard
Poissant
Ratansi
Robillard
Rogers
Rota
Ruimy
Saini
Sangha
Scarpaleggia
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Sorbara
Tan
Trudeau
Vandenbeld
Virani
Wilkinson
Wrzesnewskyj
Young — 164

PAIRED

Members

Graham
Ste-Marie

LeBlanc
Thériault — 4

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 310 defeated. I therefore declare Motions Nos. 316, 317, 324, and 329 defeated.

[*Translation*]

The next question is on Motion No. 311. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 312 to 315, 318 to 323, 325 to 328, and 330 to 358.

● (1810)

(The House divided on Motion No. 311, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 714)

YEAS

Members

Aboultaif
Allison
Angus
Barlow
Benzen
Bernier
Bezan
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Boucrice
Brassard
Cannings
Chong
Clarke
Cooper
Davies
Diotte
Dubé
Duvall
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Fast
Gallant
Généreux
Gladu
Gourde
Harder
Jeneroux
Jolibois
Kent
Kmiec
Lake
Lavallière
Lloyd
Lukiwski
MacKenzie
Mathyssen
Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound)
Nantel
Nicholson
Obhrai
Poilievre
Ramsey
Rayes
Richards
Saroya
Shields
Sorenson
Strahl
Sweet
Trost
Van Kesteren
Vecchio
Waugantall
Warkentin
Webber
Wong

Albrecht
Anderson
Aubin
Benson
Bergen
Berthold
Blaikie
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Boutin-Sweet
Brosseau
Carrie
Choquette
Clement
Cullen
Dellell
Dreeshen
Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)
Eglinski
Falk (Provencher)
Finley
Garrison
Genuis
Godin
Hardcastle
Hughes
Johns
Kelly
Kitchen
Kusie
Lauzon (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Liepert
Lobb
MacGregor
Malcolmson
McCauley (Edmonton West)
Moore
Nater
Nuttall
Paul-Hus
Quach
Rankin
Reid
Sansoucy
Schmale
Shipley
Stetski
Stubbs
Tilson
Trudel
Van Loan
Viersen
Warawa
Waugh
Weir
Yurdiga — 110

NAYS

Members

Aldag
Alleslev
Arseneault
Ayoub
Bagnell
Barsalou-Duval

Beaulieu
Bennett
Bittle
Boissonnault
Boudrias
Breton
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Chagger
Comuzzi
Dabrusin
DeCourcey
Dhillon
Dubourg
Duguid
Ehsassi
Ellis
Eyking
Fillmore
Fisher
Fortier
Fragiskatos
Fraser (Central Nova)
Fuhr
Gerretsen
Goldsmith-Jones
Gould
Hardie
Hehr
Holland
Iacono
Jordan
Khalid
Lambropoulos
Lamoureux
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Lefebvre
Levitt
Lockhart
Longfield
MacAulay (Cardigan)
Maloney
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
May (Cambridge)
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
McDonald
McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Mendès
Mihychuk
Sueurs)
Monsef
Morrissey
Nassif
Ng
O'Regan
Paradis
Peschisolido
Philpott
Plamondon
Qualtrough
Rioux
Rodriguez
Romanado
Rudd
Sahota
Samson
Sarai
Schulte
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Spengemann
Tassi
Vandal
Vaughan
Whalen
Wilson-Raybould
Yip

Beech
Bibeau
Blair
Bossio
Bratina
Caesar-Chavannes
Casey (Charlottetown)
Chen
Cuzner
Damoff
Dhaliwal
Drouin
Duclos
Duncan (Etobicoke North)
El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith
Eyolfson
Finnigan
Fonseca
Fortin
Fraser (West Nova)
Fry
Garneau
Gill
Goodale
Hajdu
Hébert
Hogg
Hutchings
Joly
Jowhari
Khera
Lametti
Lapointe
Lebouthillier
Leslie
Lightbound
Long
Ludwig
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Marcil

McCrimmon
McGuinty
McKenna
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendicino
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-

Morneau
Murray
Nault
Oliver
Ouellette
Pauzé
Petitpas Taylor
Picard
Poissant
Ratansi
Robillard
Rogers
Rota
Rouny
Saini
Sangha
Scarpaleggia
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Sorbara
Tan
Trudeau
Vandenbeld
Virani
Wilkinson
Wrzesnewskyj
Young — 166

PAIRED

Members

Graham	LeBlanc
Ste Marie	Thériault 4

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 311 defeated. I therefore declare Motions Nos. 312 to 315, 318 to 323, 325 to 328, and 330 to 358 defeated.

[*English*]

The next question is on Motion No. 359.

● (1820)

(The House divided on Motion No. 359, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 715)

YEAS

Members

Aboultaif	Albrecht
Allison	Anderson
Barlow	Benzen
Bergen	Bernier
Bezan	Blaney (Bellechasse Les Etchemins Lévis)
Brassard	Calkins
Carrie	Chong
Clarke	Clement
Cooper	Deltell
Diotte	Dreeshen
Eglinski	Falk (Battlefords Lloydminster)
Falk (Provencher)	Fast
Finley	Gallant
Généreux	Genuis
Gladu	Godin
Gourde	Harder
Jeneroux	Kelly
Kent	Kitchen
Kmiec	Kusie
Lake	Lauzon (Stormont Dundas South Glengarry)
Lapert	Lloyd
Lobb	MacKenzie
McCauley (Edmonton West)	Miller (Bruce Grey Owen Sound)
Motz	Nater
Nicholson	Nuttall
Obhrai	Paul Hus
Poilievre	Rayes
Reid	Richards
Saroya	Schmale
Shields	Shipley
Sorenson	Strahl
Stubbs	Sweet
Tilson	Trost
Van Kesteren	Van Loan
Vecchio	Viersen
Wagantall	Warawa
Warkentin	Waugh
Webber	Wong
Yurdiga 77	

NAYS

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Alleslev	Amos
Angus	Arseneault
Arya	Aubin
Ayoub	Badawey
Bagnell	Bains
Barsalou-Duval	Baylis
Beaulieu	Beech
Bennett	Benson
Bibeau	Battle
Blaikie	Blair
Blaney (North Island Powell River)	Boissonnault
Bossio	Boudrias
Boulerice	Boutin-Sweet
Bratina	Breton
Brosseau	Caesar-Chavannes
Cannings	Casey (Cumberland Colchester)
Casey (Charlottetown)	Chagger
Chen	Choquette
Cormier	Cullen
Currie	Dabrusin
Damoff	Davies
DeCourcey	Dhaliwal
Dhillon	Drouin
Dubé	Dubourg
Duclos	Duguid
Duncan (Etobicoke North)	Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)
Duvall	Dzerowicz
Ehsassi	El-Khoury
Ellis	Erskine-Smith
Eyking	Eyolfson
Fillmore	Finnigan
Fisher	Fonseca
Fortier	Fortin
Fragiskatos	Fraser (West Nova)
Fraser (Central Nova)	Fry
Fuhr	Garneau
Garrison	Gerretsen
Gill	Goldsmith-Jones
Goodale	Gould
Hajdu	Hardcastle
Hardie	Hébert
Hehr	Hogg
Holland	Hughes
Hutchings	Iacono
Jolibois	Joly
Jordan	Jowhari
Khalid	Khera
Laimbreqoukos	Lametti
Lamoureux	Lapointe
Lauzon (Argenteuil La Petite Nation)	Laverdière
Lebouthillier	Lefebvre
Leslie	Levitt
Lightbound	Lockhart
Long	Longfield
Ludwig	MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacGregor	MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Malcolmson	Maloney
Marcil	Massé (Avignon La Mitis Matane Matapédia)
Mathyssen	May (Cambridge)
May (Saanich Gulf Islands)	McCrimmon
McDonald	McGuinty
McKay	McKenna
McKinnon (Coquitlam Port Coquitlam)	McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendès	Mendicino
Mihychuk	Miller (Ville-Marie Le Sud-Ouest Île-des-Sœurs)
Monsef	Moore
Morneau	Morrissey
Murray	Nantel
Nassif	Nault
Ng	Oliver
O'Regan	Ouellette
Paradis	Pauzé
Peschisolido	Petitpas Taylor
Philpott	Picard
Plamondon	Poissant
Quach	Qualtrough
Rankin	Ratansi
Rioux	Robillard
Rodriguez	Rogers
Romanado	Rota
Rudd	Rusnak
Sahota	Saini
Samson	Sangha
Sansoucy	Sarai
Scarpaleggia	Schulte
Serré	Sgro
Shanahan	Sheehan
Sidhu (Mission Matsqui Fraser Canyon)	Sidhu (Brampton South)
Sikand	Simms
Sohara	Spengemann
Stetski	Tan
Tassi	Trudeau
Trudel	Vandal
Vandenbeld	Vaughan
Virani	Weir
Whalen	Wilkinson

Wilson Raybould — Wrzesnewskyj
Yip — Young — 198

PAIRED

Members

Graham — LeBlanc
Ste-Marie — Thériault — 4

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 359 lost.

[*Translation*]

The next question is on Motion No. 360.

● (1825)

[*English*]

(The House divided on Motion No. 360, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 716)

YEAS

Members

Aboultaif — Albrecht
Allison — Anderson
Barlow — Benzen
Berpen — Bernier
Bezan — Blaney (Bellechasse — Les Etchemins — Lévis)
Brassard — Calkins
Carrie — Chong
Clarke — Clement
Cooper — Deltell
Diotte — Dreeshen
Eglinski — Falk (Battlefords — Lloydminster)
Falk (Provencher) — Fast
Finley — Gallant
Généreux — Genuis
Gladu — Godin
Gourde — Harder
Jeneroux — Kelly
Kent — Kitchen
Kmiec — Kusie
Lake — Lauzon (Stormont — Dundas — South Glengarry)
Liepert — Lloyd
Lobb — Lukiwski
MacKenzie — McCauley (Edmonton West)
Miller (Bruce — Grey — Owen Sound) — Motz
Nater — Nicholson
Nuttall — Obhrai
Paul-Hus — Pothievre
Rayes — Reid
Richards — Saroya
Schmale — Shields
Shipley — Sorenson
Strahl — Stubbs
Sweet — Tilson
Trost — Van Kesteren
Van Loan — Vecchio
Viersen — Wagantall
Warawa — Warkentin
Waugh — Webber
Wong — Yurdiga — 78

NAYS

Members

Aldag — Alghabra
Allesley — Amos
Angus — Arseneault
Arya — Aubin
Ayoub — Badawey
Bagnell — Bains
Barsalou-Duval — Baylis
Beaulieu — Beech
Bennett — Benson
Bibeau — Bittle
Blaikie — Blair
Blaney (North Island — Powell River) — Boissonnault
Bossio — Boudrias
Boukerice — Boutin-Sweet
Bratina — Breton
Brosseau — Caesar-Chavannes
Cannings — Casey (Cumberland — Colchester)
Casey (Charlottetown) — Chagger
Chen — Choquette
Cormier — Cuzner
Damoff — Dabrusin
DeCourcey — Davies
Dhaliwal — Dhillon
Drouin — Dube
Duclos — Dubourg
Duncan (Etobicoke North) — Duguid
Duvall — Dzerowicz
Ehsassi — El-Khoury
Ellis — Erskine-Smith
Eyking — Eyolfson
Fillmore — Finnigan
Fisher — Fonseca
Fortier — Fortin
Fragiskatos — Fraser (West Nova)
Fraser (Central Nova) — Fry
Fuhr — Garneau
Garrison — Gerretsen
Giff — Goldsmith-Jones
Goodale — Gould
Hajdu — Hardcastle
Hardie — Hébert
Hehr — Hogg
Holland — Hughes
Hutchings — Iacono
Johns — Jolibois
Joly — Jordan
Jowhari — Khalid
Khera — Laodmopoulos
Lametti — Lamoureux
Lapointe — Lauzon (Argenteuil — La Petite-Nation)
Lavallière — Lebouthillier
Lefebvre — Leslie
Levitt — Lightbound
Lockhart — Long
Longfield — Ludwig
MacAulay (Cardigan) — MacGregor
MacKinnon (Gatineau) — Malcolmson
Mahoney — Marcil
Masse (Avignon — La Mitis — Matane — Matapédia) — May (Saanich — Gulf Islands)
Mathyssen — McDonald
May (Cambridge) — McKay
McCrimmon — McKinnon (Coquitlam — Port Coquitlam)
McGuinty — Mendicino
McKenna — Miller (Ville-Marie — Le Sud-Ouest — Île-des-Sœurs)
McLeod (Northwest Territories) — Monsef
Mihychuk — Moore
Morneau — Morrissey
Murray — Nantel
Nassif — Nault
Ng — Oliver
O'Regan — Ouellette
Paradis — Paradis
Peschisolido — Petitpas Taylor
Philpott — Picard
Plamondon — Poissant
Quach — Qualtrough
Ramsey — Rankin
Ratansi — Rioux
Robillard — Rodriguez
Rogers — Romanado
Rota — Rudd
Rusnty — Sahota
Sajjan — Samson
Sangha — Sansoucy
Sarai — Scarpaleggia
Schulte — Serré
Sgro — Shanahan
Sheehan — Sidhu (Mission — Matsqui — Fraser Canyon)
Sidhu (Brampton South) — Sikand
Simms — Sorbara
Spengemann — Stetski
Tan — Tassi

Trudeau
Vandal
Vaughan
Wen
Wilkinson
Wrzesnewskyj

Trudel
Vandenbeld
Virani
Whalen
Wilson-Raybould
Yip — 198

PAIRED

Members

Graham
Ste-Marie

LeBlanc
Thériault — 4

The Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion defeated.

The next question is on Motion No. 361. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 362 to 402.

● (1835)

(The House divided on Motion No. 361, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 717)

YEAS

Members

Aboultaif
Allison
Barlow
Bergen
Berthold
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Calkins
Chong
Cooper
Diotte
Dreeshen
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Fast
Gallant
Genuis
Godin
Harder
Kelly
Kitchen
Kusie
Lauzon (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Lloyd
Lukiwski
McCauley (Edmonton West)
Motz
Nicholson
Ohrai
Poilievre
Reid
Saroya
Shields
Sorenson
Stubbs
Tilson
Van Kesteren
Vecchio
Waugantall
Warkentin
Webber
Yurdiga — 79

Albrecht
Anderson
Benzen
Bernier
Bezan
Brassard
Carrie
Clement
Deltell
Doherty
Eglinski
Falk (Provencher)
Finley
Généreux
Gladu
Gourde
Jeneroux
Kent
Kmiec
Lake
Liepert
Lobb
MacKenzie
Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound)
Nater
Nuttall
Paul-Hus
Rayes
Richards
Schmale
Shipley
Strahl
Sweet
Trost
Van Loan
Viersen
Warawa
Waugh
Wong

NAYS

Members

Aldag
Alleslev
Angus
Arya
Ayoub
Bagnell
Barsalou-Duval
Beaulieu
Bennett

Alghabra
Amos
Arseneault
Aubin
Badawey
Bains
Baylis
Beech
Benson

Bibeau
Blaikie
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Bossio
Boulerice
Bratina
Brosseau
Cannings
Casey (Charlottetown)
Chen
Cormier
Currie
Damoff
DeCourcey
Dhillon
Dubé
Duclos
Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Dzerowicz
El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith
Eyolfson
Finnigan
Fonseca
Fortin
Fraser (West Nova)
Fry
Garneau
Gerretsen
Goldsmith-Jones
Gould
Hardcastle
Hébert
Hogg
Hughes
Iacono
Jolibois
Jordan
Khalid
Lambropoulos
Lamoureux
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Lebouthillier
Leslie
Lighthound
Long
Ludwig
MacGregor
Malcolmson
Marcil
Mathyssen
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
McDonald
McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Mendès
Mihychuk
Socurs)
Monsef
Morneau
Murray
Nassif
Ng
O'Regan
Paradis
Peschisolido
Petitpas Taylor
Picard
Poissant
Qualtrough
Rankin
Rioux
Rodriguez
Romanado
Rudd
Sahota
Samson
Sansoucy
Scarpaleggia
Serré
Shanahan
Stetbu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Spengemann

Bittle
Blair
Bonsonnault
Boudrias
Boutin-Sweet
Breton
Caesar-Chavannes
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Chagger
Choquette
Cullen
Dabrusin
Davies
Dhaliwal
Drouin
Dubourg
Dupuis
Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)
Ehsassi
Ellis
Eyking
Fillmore
Fisher
Fortier
Fragiskatos
Fraser (Central Nova)
Fuhr
Garrison
Gill
Goodale
Hajdu
Hardie
Hehr
Holland
Hutchings
Johns
Joly
Jowhari
Khera
Lametti
Lapointe
Laverdière
Lefebvre
Levitt
Lockhart
Longfield
MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Maloney
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
May (Cambridge)
McCrimmon
McGuinty
McKenna
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendicino
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-

Moore
Morrissey
Nantel
Nault
Oliver
Ouellette
Pauzé
Peterson
Philpott
Plamondon
Quach
Ramsey
Ratansi
Robillard
Rogers
Rota
Ruimy
Saini
Sangha
Sarai
Schulte
Sgro
Shechan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Stetski

Tan
Trudeau
Vandal
Vaughan
Wen
Wilkinson
Wrzesnewskyj
Young — 199

East
Trudel
Vandenbeld
Virani
Whalen
Wilson-Raybould
Yip

PAIRED

Members

Graham
Ste-Marie

LeBlanc
Thériault — 4

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 361 defeated. I therefore declare Motions Nos. 362 to 402 also defeated.

[*Translation*]

The next question is on Motion No. 403. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 404 to 409.

● (1840)

(The House divided on Motion No. 403, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 718)

YEAS

Members

Aboultaif
Allison
Barlow
Bergen
Berthold
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Calkins
Chong
Cooper
Diotte
Dreeshen
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Fast
Gallant
Genuis
Godin
Harder
Kelly
Kitchen
Kusie
Lauzon (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Lloyd
Lukiwski
McCauley (Edmonton West)
Motz
Nicholson
Obhrai
Poilievre
Reid
Saroya
Shields
Sorenson
Stubbs
Tilson
Van Kesteren
Vecchio
Warawa
Waugh
Wong

Albrecht
Anderson
Benzen
Bernier
Bezan
Brassard
Carrie
Clement
Deltell
Doherty
Eglinski
Falk (Provencher)
Finley
Generoux
Gladu
Gourde
Jeneroux
Kent
Kmiec
Lake
Lemieux
Lobb
MacKenzie
Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound)
Nater
Nuttall
Paul-Hus
Rayes
Richards
Schmale
Shipley
Strahl
Sweet
Trost
Van Loan
Viersen
Warkentin
Webber
Yurdiga — 78

NAYS

Members

Aldag
Alleslev
Angus
Arya

Alghabra
Amos
Arseneault
Aubin

Ayoub
Bagnell
Barsalou-Duval
Beaulieu
Bennett
Bibeau
Blaikie
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Bossio
Boulerice
Bratina
Brosseau
Cannings
Casey (Charlottetown)
Chen
Cormier
Currie
Damoff
DeCourcey
Dhillon
Dubé
Duclos
Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Duvall
Ehsassi
Ellis
Eyking
Fillmore
Fisher
Fortier
Fragiskatos
Fraser (Central Nova)
Fuhr
Garrison
Gill
Goodale
Hajdu
Hardie
Hehr
Holland
Hutchings
Johns
Joly
Jowhari
Khera
Lametti
Lapointe
Lavallée
Lefebvre
Levitt
Lockhart
Longfield
MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Mahoney
Mathyssen
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
McDonald
McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Mendès
Mihychuk
Nassif
Ng
O'Regan
Paradis
Peschisolido
Peterson
Picard
Poissant
Qualtrough
Rankin
Rioux
Rodriguez
Romanado
Rudd
Sahota
Samson
Sansoucy
Scarpaleggia

Badawey
Bains
Baylis
Beech
Benson
Bittle
Blair
Boissonnault
Boudrias
Boutin-Sweet
Bricker
Caesar-Chavannes
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Chagger
Choquette
Cullen
Dabrusin
Davies
Dhaliwal
Drouin
Dubourg
Duguid
Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)
Dzerowicz
El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith
Eyolfson
Finnigan
Fonseca
Fortin
Fraser (West Nova)
Fry
Garneau
Gerretsen
Goldsmith-Jones
Gould
Hardcastle
Hébert
Hogg
Hughes
Iacono
Jaffer
Jordan
Khalid
Lambropoulos
Lamoureux
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Lebouthillier
Leslie
Lightbound
Long
Ludwig
MacGregor
Malcolmson
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
May (Cambridge)
McCrimmon
McGuinty
McKenna
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendicino
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-

Moore
Morrissey
Nantel
Nault
Oliver
Ouellette
Pauzé
Peterson
Philpott
Plamondon
Quach
Ramsey
Ratansi
Robillard
Rogers
Ruta
Rusnak
Sajjan
Sangha
Sarai
Schulte

Sorenson
Shanahan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Sorbara
Stetski
Tassi
Trudel
Vandenbeld
Virani
Whalen
Wilson-Raybould
Yip

Spengemann
Tan
Erskine-Smith
Vandal
Vaughan
Wrzesnewskyj
Young — 200

PAIRED

Members

Graham — LeBlanc
Ste-Marie — Thériault — 4

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 403 defeated. I therefore declare Motions Nos. 404 to 409 defeated.

[*English*]

Hon. Bill Morneau (Minister of Finance, Lib.) moved that Bill C-74, an act to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on February 27, 2018 and other measures, be concurred in at report stage.

The Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

● (1850)

(The House divided on the motion, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 719)

YEAS

Members

Abbott
Albrecht
Alghabra
Amos
Anderson
Arya
Ashton
Badawey
Bagnell
Bains
Baylis
Beech
Bennett
Bibeau
Bittle
Blair
Boissonnault
Bossio
Bratina
Breton
Caesar-Chavannes
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Casey (Charlottetown)
Chagger
Chen
Cormier
Cuzner
Dabrusin
Damoff
DeCourcey
Dhaliwal
Dhillon
Dion
Dubourg
Duclos
Duguid
Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Dzerowicz

Ehsassi
Ellis
Eyking
Fillmore
Fisher
Fortier
Fraser (West Nova)
Fry
Garneau
Goldsmith-Jones
Gould
Hardie
Hehr
Holland
Iacono
Jordan
Khalid
Lambropoulos
Lamoureux
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Lebouthillier
Leslie
Lightbound
Long
Ludwig
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Maloney
May (Cambridge)
McDonald
McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Mendès
Mihychuk
Monsef
Morneau
Murray
Nassif
Ng
O'Regan
Paradis
Peterson
Philpott
Poissant
Ratansi
Robillard
Rogers
Rota
Rouleau
Saini
Sangha
Scarpaleggia
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Sorbara
Tan
Tassi
Vandenbeld
Virani
Wilkinson
Wrzesnewskyj
Young — 139

El Khoury
Erskine-Smith
Eyolfson
Finnigan
Fonseca
Freeland
Fraser (Central Nova)
Fuhr
Garrison
Goodale
Hajdu
Hébert
Hogg
Hutchings
Joly
Joseph
Khera
Lametti
Lapointe
Lebouthillier
Leslie
Lightbound
Long
Ludwig
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
McCrimmon
McGuinty
McKenna
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendicino
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-

Morneau
Murray
Nault
Oliver
Ouellette
Peschisolido
Petitpas Taylor
Picard
Qualtrough
Rioux
Rodriguez
Romanado
Rudd
Sahota
Samson
Sarai
Schulte
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Spengemann
Tassi
Vandal
Vaughan
Whalen
Wilson-Raybould
Yip

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif
Albas
Allison
Angus
Barlow
Benzen
Berthold
Bezan
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Boucher
Boudrias
Boulerice
Brassard
Caesar
Calkins
Carrie
Chabot
Choquette
Clement
Cullen
Davies
Deltell

Albrecht
Anderson
Aubin
Barsalou-Duval
Benson
Bergen
Berthold
Blaikie
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Boudrias
Brassard
Calkins
Carrie
Choquette
Clement
Cullen
Diotte

Doherty
Dubé
Duvall
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Fast
Fortin
Genereux
Gill
Godin
Hardcastle
Hughes
Johns
Kelly
Kitchen
Kusie
Lauzon (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Liepert
Lobb
MacGregor
Malcolmson
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound)
Motz
Nater
Nuttall
Paul-Hus
Plamondon
Quach
Rankin
Read
Sansoucy
Schmale
Shipley
Stanton
Strahl
Sweet
Trost
Van Kesteren
Vecchio
Wagantall
Warkentin
Webber
Wong
Dreeshen
Duncan (Edmonton—Strathcona)
Eglinski
Falk (Provencher)
Finley
Garrison
Genuis
Gladu
Gourde
Harder
Jeneroux
Jolibois
Kent
Kmiec
Lake
Laverdière
Lloyd
Lukiwski
MacKenzie
Mathyssen
McCauley (Edmonton West)
Moore
Nantel
Nicholson
Obhrai
Pauzé
Poilievre
Ramsey
Rayes
Richards
Saroya
Shields
Sorenson
Stetski
Stubbs
Tilson
Trudel
Van Loan
Viersen
Warawa
Waugh
Weir
Yurdiga — 120

PAIRED

Members

Graham — LeBlanc
Ste-Marie — Thériault — 4

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

When shall the bill be read a third time? At the next sitting of the House.

[*Translation*]

The House resumed from May 31 consideration of Bill C-47, An Act to amend the Export and Import Permits Act and the Criminal Code (amendments permitting the accession to the Arms Trade Treaty and other amendments), as reported (with amendments) from the committee; and of the motions in Group No. 1.

The Speaker: Pursuant to order made on Tuesday, May 29, the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the motion at report stage of Bill C-47.

The question is on Motion No. 1.

[*Chair read text of motion to the House*]

Hon. Pablo Rodriguez: Mr. Speaker, I believe if you seek it, you will find agreement to apply the result from the previous vote to this vote, with Liberal members voting no.

[*English*]

Mr. Mark Strahl: Mr. Speaker, we agree to apply the vote, with Conservative members voting no.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Marjolaine Boutin-Sweet: Mr. Speaker, the NDP agrees to apply the vote and will vote yes.

Mr. Rhéal Fortin: Mr. Speaker, the members of Québec Debout agree to apply the vote and will vote yes.

Mrs. Marilène Gill: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois agrees to apply the vote and will vote yes.

[*English*]

Mr. Erin Weir: Mr. Speaker, the CCF is good to apply—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: I am afraid we have to ask the member for Regina—Lewvan to repeat. We could not hear which way he was voting. Would he say it again, please.

Mr. Erin Weir: Mr. Speaker, the CCF will be voting yes.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Elizabeth May: Mr. Speaker, the Green Party agrees to apply the vote and will vote yes.

● (1855)

(The House divided on Motion No. 1, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 720)

YEAS

Members

Angus
Barsalou-Duval
Benson
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Boulerice
Brosseau
Choquette
Davies
Duncan (Edmonton—Strathcona)
Fortin
Gill
Hughes
Jolibois
MacGregor
Mathyssen
Moore
Pauzé
Quach
Rankin
Stetski
Weir — 41

Aubin
Beaulieu
Blaikie
Boudrias
Boutin-Sweet
Cannings
Cullen
Dubé
Duvall
Garrison
Hardcastle
Johns
Laverdière
Malcolmson
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
Nantel
Plamondon
Ramsey
Sansoucy
Trudel

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif
Aldag
Allesley
Amos
Arseneault
Ayoub
Bagnell
Barlow
Beech
Benzen
Bernier
Bezan
Bittle
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Bossio
Bratina
Caesar-Chavannes

Albrecht
Alghabra
Allison
Anderson
Arya
Badawey
Bains
Baylis
Bennett
Bergen
Berthold
Ribeau
Blair
Boissonnault
Brassard
Breton
Calkins

Carrie
Casey (Charlottetown)
Chen
Clarke
Cooper
Cuzner
Damoff
Dhaliwal
Diotte
Dreeshen
Dubourg
Duguid
Dzerowicz
Ehsassi
Ellis
Eyking
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Fast
Finley
Fisher
Fortier
Fraser (West Nova)
Fry
Garneau
Genuis
Gladu
Goldsmith-Jones
Gould
Hajdu
Hardie
Hehr
Holland
Iacono
Joly
Jowhari
Kent
Khera
Kmiec
Lake
Lametti
Lapointe
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Lefebvre
Levitt
Lightbound
Lobb
Long
Ludwig
MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
May (Cambridge)
McCauley (Edmonton West)
McDonald
McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Mendès
Mihychuk
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Sœurs)
Monsef
Morneau
Motz
Nassif
Nault
Nicholson
Obhrai
O'Regan
Paradis
Peschisolido
Petitpas Taylor
Picard
Poissant
Ratansi
Reid
Rioux
Rodriguez
Romanado
Rudd
Sahota
Samson
Sarai
Scarpaleggia
Schulte
Sgro
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Chagger
Chong
Clement
Cormier
Dabrusin
DeCourcey
Dhillon
Doherty
Drouin
Duclos
Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Eglinski
El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith
Eyolfson
Falk (Provencher)
Fillmore
Finnigan
Fonseca
Fragiskatos
Fraser (Central Nova)
Fuhr
Genereux
Gerretsen
Godin
Goodale
Gourde
Harder
Hébert
Hogg
Hutchings
Jeneroux
Jordan
Kelly
Khalid
Kitchen
Kusie
Lambropoulos
Lamoureux
Lauzon (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Lebouthillier
Leslie
Liepert
Lloyd
Lockhart
Longfield
Lukiwski
MacKenzie
Maloney
McCrimmon
McGuinty
McKenna
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendicino
Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound)
Morrissey
Murray
Nater
Ng
Nuttall
Oliver
Ouellette
Paul-Hus
Peterson
Philpott
Poilievre
Qualtrough
Raves
Richards
Robillard
Rogers
Rota
Rumy
Saini
Sangha
Saroya
Schmale
Serré
Shanahan
Sheehan
Shipley
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Sorenson
Stanton
Stubbs
Tan
Tilson
Trudeau
Van Loan
Vandenbeld
Vecchio
Virani
Warawa
Waugh
Whalen
Wilson-Raybould
Wrzesnewsky)
Young
Shields
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Sohara
Spengemann
Strahl
Sweet
Tassi
Trost
Van Kesteren
Vandal
Vaughan
Viersen
Wagantall
Warkentin
Webber
Wilkinson
Wong
Yip
Yurdiga — 238

PAIRED

Members

Graham
Ste-Marie
LeBlanc
Thériault — 4

The Speaker: I declare the motion defeated.

[*English*]

The next question is on Motion No. 2.

Hon. Pablo Rodriguez: Mr. Speaker, I believe that if you seek it you will find agreement to apply the result of the previous vote to this vote, with Liberal members voting no.

Mr. Mark Strahl: Mr. Speaker, we agree to apply, with Conservative members voting yes.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Marjolaine Boutin-Sweet: Mr. Speaker, the NDP agrees to apply the vote and will vote no.

Mr. Rhéal Fortin: Mr. Speaker, Québec Debout agrees to apply the vote and will vote no.

Mrs. Marilène Gill: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois agrees to apply the vote and will be voting no.

[*English*]

Mr. Erin Weir: Mr. Speaker, the CCF agrees to apply the vote and will be voting no.

Ms. Elizabeth May: Mr. Speaker, I will be voting no.

(The House divided on Motion No. 2, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 721)

YEAS

Members

Aboultaif
Allison
Barlow
Bergen
Berthold
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Calkins
Chong
Clement
Diotte
Dreeshen
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Fast
Genereux
Albrecht
Anderson
Benzen
Bernier
Bezan
Brassard
Carrie
Clarke
Cooper
Doherty
Eglinski
Falk (Provencher)
Finley
Genuis

Glada
Gourde
Jeneroux
Kent
Kmiec
Lake
Liepert
Lobb
MacKenzie
Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound)
Nater
Nuttall
Paul-Hus
Rayes
Richards
Schmale
Shipley
Stanton
Stubbs
Tilson
Van Kesteren
Vecchio
Wagantall
Warkentin
Webber
Yurdiga — 79

Godin
Harder
Kelly
Kitchen
Kusie
Lauzon (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Lloyd
Lukiwski
McCauley (Edmonton West)
Motz
Nicholson
Oliphant
Poilievre
Reid
Saroya
Shields
Sorenson
Strahl
Sweet
Trost
Van Loan
Viersen
Warawa
Waugh
Wong

NAYS

Members

Aldag
Alleslev
Angus
Arya
Ayoub
Bagnell
Barsalou-Duval
Beaulieu
Bennett
Bibeau
Blaikie
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Bossio
Boulerice
Bratina
Brosseau
Cannings
Casey (Charlottetown)
Chen
Cormier
Cuzner
Damoff
DeCourcey
Dhillon
Dubé
Duclos
Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Duvall
Ehsassi
Ellis
Eyking
Fillmore
Fisher
Fortier
Fragiskatos
Fraser (Central Nova)
Fuhr
Garrison
Gill
Goodale
Hajdu
Hardie
Hehr
Holland
Hutchings
Johns
Joly
Jowhari
Khera
Lametti
Lapointe
Laverdière
Lefebvre

Alghabra
Amos
Arseneault
Aubin
Badawey
Bains
Baylis
Beech
Benson
Bittle
Blair
Boissonnault
Boudrias
Boutin-Sweet
Breton
Caesar-Chavannes
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Chagger
Choquette
Cullen
Dabrusin
Davies
Dhaliwal
Drouin
Dubourg
Duguid
Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)
Dzerowicz
El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith
Eyolfson
Finnigan
Fonseca
Fortin
Fraser (West Nova)
Fry
Gameau
Gerretsen
Goldsmith-Jones
Gould
Hardcastle
Hébert
Hogg
Hughes
Iacono
Jolibois
Jordan
Khalid
Lambropoulos
Lamoureux
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Lebouthillier
Leslie

Levitt
Lockhart
Longfield
MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Maloney
Mathyssen
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
McDonald
McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Mendès
Mihychuk
Soeurs)
Monsef
Morneau
Murray
Nassif
Ng
O'Regan
Paradis
Peschisolido
Petitpas Taylor
Picard
Poissant
Qualtrough
Rankin
Rioux
Rodriguez
Romanado
Rudd
Sahota
Samson
Sansoucy
Scarpaleggia
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Sorbara
Stetski
Tassi
Trudel
Vandenbeld
Virani
Whalen
Wilson-Raybould
Yip

Lightbound
Long
Ludwig
MacGregor
Malcolmson
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
May (Cambridge)
McCrimmon
McGuinty
McKenna
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendicino
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-

Moore
Morrissey
Nantel
Nault
Oliver
Ouellette
Pauzé
Peterson
Philpott
Plamondon
Quach
Ramsey
Ratansi
Robillard
Rogers
Rota
Rumy
Saini
Sangha
Sarai
Schulte
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Spengemann
Tan
Trudeau
Vandal
Vaughan
Weir
Wilkinson
Wrzesnewskyj
Young — 200

PAIRED

Members

Graham — LeBlanc
Ste-Marie — Thériault — 4

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 2 defeated.

Hon. Ralph Goodale (for the Minister of Foreign Affairs) moved that the bill be concurred in.

The Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

[*Translation*]

Hon. Pablo Rodriguez: résultatMr. Speaker, I believe you will find unanimous consent to apply the results of the previous vote to the current vote, with Liberal members voting yes.

[*English*]

Mr. Mark Strahl: Mr. Speaker, we agree to apply and will be voting no.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Marjolaine Boutin-Sweet: Mr. Speaker, the NDP agrees to apply the vote and will vote no.

Mr. Rhéal Fortin: Mr. Speaker, Québec Debout agrees to apply the vote and will vote no.

Mrs. Marilène Gill: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois agrees to apply the vote and will vote no.

[*English*]

Mr. Erin Weir: Mr. Speaker, the CCF agrees to apply and will vote no.

Ms. Elizabeth May: Mr. Speaker, the Green Party agrees to apply and will be voting yes.

[*Translation*]

(The House divided on the motion, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 722)

YEAS

Members

Aldag
Alleslev
Arseneault
Ayoub
Bagnell
Baylis
Bennett
Bittle
Boissonnault
Bratina
Caesar-Chavannes
Casey (Charlottetown)
Chen
Cuzner
Dabrusin
Damoff
Dhaliwal
Drouin
Duclos
Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Ehsassi
Ellis
Eyking
Fillmore
Fisher
Fortier
Fraser (West Nova)
Fry
Garneau
Goldsmith-Jones
Gould
Hardie
Hehr
Holland
Iacono
Jordan
Khalid
Lambropoulos
Lamoureux
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Lefebvre
Levitt
Lockhart
Longfield
MacAulay (Cardigan)
Maloney
May (Cambridge)
McCrimmon
McGuinty
McKenna
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendicino
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Sœurs)
Monsef
Morneau
Murray
Nault
Oliver
Ouellette
Peschisolido
Petitpas Taylor
Picard
Qualtrough
Rioux
Rodriguez
Romanado
Rudd
Sahota
Samson
Sarai
Schulte
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Spengemann
Tassi
Vandal
Vaughan
Whalen
Wilson-Raybould
Yip
Alghabra
Amos
Arya
Badawey
Bains
Beech
Bibeau
Blair
Bossio
Breton
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Chagger
Cormier
DeCourcey
Dhillon
Dubourg
Duguid
Dzerowicz
El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith
Eyolfson
Finnigan
Fonseca
Fragiskatos
Fraser (Central Nova)
Fuhr
Gerretsen
Goodale
Hajdu
Hébert
Hogg
Hutchings
Joly
Jowhari
Khera
Lametti
Lapointe
Lebouthillier
Leslie
Lightbound
Long
Ludwig
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Masse (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
McDonald
McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Mendès
Mihychuk
Morrissey
Nassif
Ng
O'Regan
Paradis
Peterson
Philpott
Poissant
Ratansi
Robillard
Rogers
Rota
Ruimy
Saini
Sangha
Scarpaleggia
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Sorbara
Tan
Trudeau
Vandenbeld
Virani
Wilkinson
Wrzesnewskyj
Young — 160

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif
Allison
Angus
Barlow
Beaulieu
Benzen
Bernier
Bezan
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Boudrias
Boutin-Sweet
Brosseau
Cannings
Chong
Clarke
Cooper
Davies
Doherty
Dubé
Duvall
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Fast
Fortin
Généreux
Gill
Godin
Hardcastle
Hughes
Johns
Kelly
Kitchen
Kusie
Lauzon (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Liepert
Lobb
MacGregor
Malcolmson
McCauley (Edmonton West)
Albrecht
Anderson
Aubin
Barsalou-Duval
Benson
Bergen
Berthold
Blaikie
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Boulerice
Brassard
Calkins
Carrie
Choquette
Clement
Cullen
Diotte
Dreeshen
Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)
Eglinski
Falk (Provencher)
Finley
Garrison
Genuis
Gladu
Gourde
Harder
Jeneroux
Jolibois
Kent
Kmiec
Lake
Laverdière
Lloyd
Lukiwski
MacKenzie
Mathyssen
Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound)

Moore		Motz	
Nantel		Nater	
Nicholson		Nuttall	
Obhrai		Paul-Hus	
Pauzé		Plamondon	
Poilievre		Quach	
Ramsey		Rankin	
Rayes		Reid	
Richards		Sansoucy	
Saroya		Schmale	
Shields		Shipley	
Sorenson		Stanton	
Stetski		Strahl	
Stubbs		Sweet	
Tilson		Trost	
Trudel		Van Kesteren	
Van Loan		Vecchio	
Viersen		Wagantall	
Warawa		Warkentin	
Waugh		Webber	
Weir		Wong	
Yurdiga	119		

PAIRED

Members

Graham		LeBlanc	
Ste-Marie		Thériault	4

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

* * *

● (1900)

[*English*]

FEDERAL SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT ACT

The House resumed from June 1 consideration of the motion that Bill C-57, an act to amend the Federal Sustainable Development Act, be read the third time and passed.

The Speaker: Pursuant to order made on Tuesday, May 29, 2018, the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the motion at third reading stage of Bill C-57, an act to amend the Federal Sustainable Development Act.

Hon. Pablo Rodriguez: Mr. Speaker, I believe if you seek it, you will find agreement to apply the result from the previous vote to this vote, with Liberal members voting yes.

Mr. Mark Strahl: Mr. Speaker, we agree to apply and Conservative members will be voting yes. I would note the member for Saskatoon—University is no longer in the chamber.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Marjolaine Boutin-Sweet: Mr. Speaker, the NDP will also be voting yes.

Mr. Rhéal Fortin: Mr. Speaker, Québec Debout agrees to apply the vote and will vote yes.

Mrs. Marilène Gill: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois agrees to apply the vote and will be voting yes.

[*English*]

Mr. Erin Weir: Mr. Speaker, the CCF agrees to apply and will also vote yes.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Elizabeth May: Mr. Speaker, the Green Party also agrees to apply the vote and will be voting yes.

[*English*]

(The House divided on the motion, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 723)

YEAS

Members

Aboultaif		Albrecht	
Aldag		Alghabra	
Alleslev		Allison	
Amos		Anderson	
Angus		Arseneault	
Arya		Aubin	
Ayoub		Badawey	
Bagnell		Bains	
Barlow		Barsalou-Duval	
Baylis		Beaulieu	
Beech		Bennett	
Benson		Benzen	
Bergen		Bernier	
Berthold		Bezan	
Bibeau		Bittle	
Blaikie		Blair	
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)		Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)	
Boissonnault		Bossio	
Boudrias		Boulerice	
Boutin-Sweet		Brassard	
Bratina		Breton	
Brosseau		Caesar-Chavannes	
Calkins		Cannings	
Carrie		Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)	
Casey (Charlottetown)		Chagger	
Chen		Chong	
Choquette		Clarke	
Clement		Cooper	
Cormier		Cullen	
Cuzner		Dabrusin	
Damoff		Davies	
DeCourcey		Dhaliwal	
Dhillon		Diotte	
Doherty		Dreeshen	
Drouin		Dubé	
Dubourg		Duclos	
Duguid		Duncan (Etobicoke North)	
Duncan (Edmonton—Strathcona)		Duvall	
Dzerowicz		Eglinski	
Ehsassi		El-Khoury	
Ellis		Erskine-Smith	
Eyking		Eyolfson	
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)		Falk (Provencher)	
Fast		Fillmore	
Finley		Finnigan	
Fisher		Fonseca	
Fortier		Fortin	
Fragiskatos		Fraser (West Nova)	
Fraser (Central Nova)		Fry	
Fuhr		Garneau	
Garrison		Généreux	
Genuis		Gerretsen	
Gill		Gladu	
Godin		Goldsmith-Jones	
Goodale		Gould	
Gourde		Hajdu	
Hardcastle		Harder	
Hardie		Hébert	
Hehr		Hogg	
Holland		Hughes	
Hutchings		Iacono	
Jeneroux		Johns	
Jolibois		Joly	
Jordan		Jowhari	
Kelly		Kent	
Khalid		Khera	
Kitchen		Kmiec	
Kusie		Lake	
Lambropoulos		Lametti	
Lamoureux		Lapointe	
Lauzon (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)		Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)	
Lavendière		Lebouthillier	

Lefebvre	Leslie
Levitt	Liepert
Lightbound	Lloyd
Lobb	Lockhart
Long	Longfield
Ludwig	Lukiwski
MacAulay (Cardigan)	MacGregor
MacKenzie	MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Malcolmson	Maloney
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)	
Mathyssen	
May (Cambridge)	May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
McCauley (Edmonton West)	McCrimmon
McDonald	McGuinty
McKay	McKenna
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendès	Mendicino
Mihychuk	Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound)
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Soeurs)	
Monsef	
Moore	Morneau
Morrissey	Motz
Murray	Nantel
Nassif	Nater
Nault	Ng
Nicholson	Nuttall
Obhrai	Oliver
O'Regan	Ouellette
Paradis	Paul-Hus
Pauzé	Peschisolido
Peterson	Petitpas Taylor
Philpott	Picard
Plamondon	Poilievre
Poissant	Quach
Qualtrough	Ramsey
Rankin	Ratansi
Rayes	Reid
Richards	Rioux
Robillard	Rodriguez
Rogers	Romanado
Rota	Rudd
Ruimy	Sahota
Saini	Samson
Sangha	Sansoucy
Sarai	Saroya
Scarpaleggia	Schmale
Schulte	Serré
Sgro	Shanahan
Sheehan	Shields
Shipley	Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sidhu (Brampton South)	Sikand
Simms	Sorbara
Sorenson	Spengemann
Stanton	Stetski
Strahl	Stubbs
Sweet	Tan
Tassi	Tilson
Trudeau	Trudel
Van Kesteren	Van Loan
Vandal	Vandenbeld
Vaughan	Vecchio
Viersen	Virani
Wagantall	Warawa
Warkentin	Waugh
Webber	Weir
Whalen	Wilkinson
Wilson-Raybould	Wong
Wrzesnewskyj	Yip
Young	Yurdiga — 278

NAYS

Nil

PAIRED

Members

Graham	LeBlanc
Ste-Marie	Thériault — 4

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

(Bill read the third time and passed)

Speaker's Ruling

[*Translation*]

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

OPPOSITION MOTION—UNITED NATIONS DECLARATION ON THE RIGHTS OF INDIGENOUS PEOPLES

The House resumed consideration of the motion.

The Speaker: It being 7 p.m., it is my duty to put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of the business of supply.

The question is on the motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And five or more members having risen:

Ms. Marjolaine Boutin-Sweet: Mr. Speaker, we ask that the division be deferred until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 5, 2018, at the expiry of the time provided for oral questions.

[*English*]

The Speaker: Pursuant to order made on Tuesday, May 29 the division stands deferred until June 5, at the expiry of the time provided for oral questions.

* * *

PRIVILEGE

RIGHTS OF MEMBERS IN RAISING POINTS OF ORDER

The Speaker: I am now prepared to rule on the question of privilege raised on May 25, 2018, by the member for Elmwood—Transcona concerning the rights of members.

In raising his question of privilege, the hon. member for Elmwood—Transcona alleged that in terminating his arguments related to his point of order on the procedural propriety of vote 40 under Treasury Board in the main estimates, the Chair breached his privileges by casting aspersions on his motives for raising the point of order. The member assured the House that in raising the point of order, he was not prompted by any ulterior motive. He asked that the actions taken by the Chair be found to be a prima facie breach of privilege that the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs might examine the issue.

It is well established that when making a case on either questions of privilege or points of order, members are expected to make brief presentations on the issue being raised. The Chair, once satisfied that sufficient information has been given, may inform the member accordingly. The Chair may then rule immediately or take the matter under advisement.

Speaker's Ruling

● (1905)

[*Translation*]

As I indicated when the point of order was first raised, *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, third edition, states at page 638, "Under the *Standing Orders*, a brief presentation of arguments on the point of order is possible at the Speaker's discretion."

Acting Speaker Devolin explained this well on June 13, 2012, at page 9374 of the *Debates*, when he stated, "...the floor is not the members' until they choose to stop. The Speaker has a right to terminate that discussion...That is left to the judgment of the Speaker." This is to say that members do not have unlimited time to speak.

[*English*]

Additionally, once the Speaker has ruled or determined that sufficient information has been presented, it is not in keeping with our practices that members use new points of order, for it can be perceived as undermining and questioning the authority of the Chair.

In the present case, the charge that the member for Elmwood—Transcona brought forward as a question of privilege cannot be seen as anything other than a challenge to this authority. Bosc and Gagnon at page 641 is clear:

> A Member may not rise on a point of order to discuss a matter which the Speaker has already ruled was not a question of privilege or to raise a matter as a question of privilege after the Speaker has ruled that it was not a point of order.

To be clear, our procedural practices and traditions prohibit the use of questions of privilege or points of order in this fashion precisely so that the authority of the Chair is not casually or repeatedly challenged.

[*Translation*]

I also want to take a moment to address the events of May 25 more generally. The proceedings that day were disorderly to a degree rarely seen. As the speaker, I am called upon to be the guardian of the rights and privileges of all members and of the House; with this comes a responsibility to preserve order and decorum. Standing Order 10 clearly sets this out: "The Speaker shall preserve order and decorum, and shall decide questions of order. In deciding a point of order or practice, the Speaker shall state the Standing Order or other authority applicable to the case. No debate shall be permitted on any such decision, and no such decision shall be subject to an appeal to the House."

[*English*]

In conjunction with this, it is important to remember, as my predecessor explained, at page 15799 of the *Debates*, on April 23, 2013, that:

> ...members elect a Speaker from among the membership to apply rules they themselves have devised and can amend. Thus, it is only with the active participation of the members themselves that the Speaker, who requires the support and goodwill of the House in order to carry out the duties of the office, can apply the rules.

Thus, the Speaker's authority can be effectively exercised only with the full support of all member of this House. It is in the interest of the House as an institution that members behave in a way that ensures that its deliberations are carried out properly and respectfully. It is incumbent on all of us to protect the reputation of the House of Commons and to conduct ourselves in such a way that we do not diminish it in the eyes of our fellow citizens.

[*Translation*]

The Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs also undertook a study on order and decorum back in 2007. Conclusions stemming from the committee's 37th report should guide all of us in this place, as it stated:

> The Speaker's authority can only be exercised if he or she has the support and guidance of all parties and each Member of the House. The recognized parties in the House undertake to assist the Speaker in this regard, and not to undermine his decisions. It is incumbent upon all of us, as Members of the House, to support the Speaker in this regard. We strongly believe that it is in the interests of the House as an institution with a long and important history, and as the elected representatives of the people of Canada, that the Speaker and all Members do what is necessary to ensure that the House is viewed as a place worthy of respect and admiration.

As Speaker, I have found that what is necessary to do is not always easy, predictable, or straightforward. In other words, it is not an exact science. In fact, it is an imperfect one. The Chair understands this is equally true of what members must face, given the context in which we work. Decisions and responses of the Chair must be firmly guided by what the House has authorized as its rules and practices and, more important, what it feels is in the House's best interest in the short and long term. At the same time, these decisions are often borne in response to immediate, new, and evolving situations.

In marrying these two realities, the Chair endeavours at all times to guide the House through its deliberations in a fair manner, one that respects members individually and collectively. While the different roles and different responsibilities of members and the Chair may seem at times hard to balance, I, as Speaker and as an elected representative, firmly believe that together we are still working in pursuit of this shared objective as described in the 2007 report of the procedure and House affairs committee.

As your Speaker, I am your servant, and I preside over the proceedings based upon the rules that you have given me. We are used to robust and heated debate. I have every confidence that while in this case there is no prima facie question of privilege, we have found a productive and respective way to continue our important work.

I thank all honourable members for their attention.

[*For continuation of proceedings see Part B*]

CONTENTS

Monday, June 4, 2018

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Endangered Whales

Motion ... 20125
Ms. Malcolmson ... 20125
Ms. Hutchings ... 20126
Mr. Doherty ... 20127
Mr. Stetski ... 20128
Mr. Erskine-Smith ... 20130
Ms. Ludwig ... 20132
Division on amendment deferred ... 20133

Suspension of Sitting

(The sitting of the House was suspended at 11:58 a.m.) ... 20133

Sitting resumed

(The House resumed at 12 p.m.) ... 20133

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Business of Supply

Opposition Motion — United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples

Mr. Saganash ... 20133
Motion ... 20133
Ms. Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona) ... 20133
Mr. Alghabra ... 20134
Mr. Cullen ... 20134
Mr. Saganash ... 20135
Mr. Baylis ... 20136
Ms. Rudd ... 20136
Ms. Malcolmson ... 20138
Mr. Waugh ... 20139
Ms. Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona) ... 20139
Mr. Vaughan ... 20139
Mrs. Stubbs ... 20140
Ms. Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona) ... 20143
Mr. Deltell ... 20143
Mr. Waugh ... 20144
Mr. Rankin ... 20144
Mr. Vaughan ... 20146
Ms. Gladu ... 20146
Mr. Waugh ... 20146
Ms. Jolibois ... 20146
Mr. Erskine-Smith ... 20148
Mr. Waugh ... 20148
Mr. Cannings ... 20148
Mr. Ruimy ... 20148

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Frederick Engelbrecht

Mr. Bratina ... 20149

Wedding Anniversary

Mrs. Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster) ... 20149

Squadron 687 Richelieu Laval

Mrs. Nassif ... 20149

Oceans Day Sunday

Ms. Malcolmson ... 20149

Deceased Former Parliamentarians

Mr. Serré ... 20150

Beauport—Limoilou

Mr. Clarke ... 20150

Portugal Heritage Month

Mr. Fonseca ... 20150

Markham Thunder

Ms. Ng ... 20150

74th Anniversary of D-Day

Mr. Van Loan ... 20151

National Indigenous History Month

Mr. McLeod (Northwest Territories) ... 20151

Italian Heritage Month

Mr. Iacono ... 20151

M.G. L'Heureux Farm

Mr. Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis) ... 20151

Pride Season

Mr. Boissonnault ... 20151

Thomas "Dubby" Duvall

Mr. Duvall ... 20152

Justice

Mr. Motz ... 20152

National Canada Survivors Day

Mr. Hébert ... 20152

ORAL QUESTIONS

Natural Resources

Mr. Scheer ... 20152
Mr. Trudeau ... 20152
Mr. Scheer ... 20153
Mr. Trudeau ... 20153

International Trade

Mr. Scheer ... 20153
Mr. Trudeau ... 20153
Mr. Scheer ... 20153
Mr. Trudeau ... 20153

Foreign Affairs

Mr. Scheer ... 20153
Mr. Trudeau ... 20153

Natural Resources

Ms. Brosseau ... 20153
Mr. Trudeau ... 20153

Indigenous Affairs
Ms. Brosseau ... 20154
Mr. Trudeau ... 20154
Ms. Jolibois ... 20154
Mr. Trudeau ... 20154

Natural Resources
Mr. Cullen ... 20154
Mr. Trudeau ... 20154

International Trade
Mr. Berthold ... 20154
Mr. MacAulay ... 20154

Agriculture and Agri-Food
Mr. Barlow ... 20155
Mr. MacAulay ... 20155
Ms. Bergen ... 20155
Mr. MacAulay ... 20155

Taxation
Mr. Poilievre ... 20155
Mr. Wilkinson ... 20155
Mr. Poilievre ... 20155
Mr. Wilkinson ... 20155
Mr. Poilievre ... 20155
Mr. Wilkinson ... 20156

The Economy
Ms. Trudel ... 20156
Mr. Bains ... 20156
Ms. Ramsey ... 20156
Mr. Leslie ... 20156

Natural Resources
Mrs. Stubbs ... 20156
Mr. Morneau ... 20156
Mrs. Stubbs ... 20156
Mr. Morneau ... 20157
Mr. Deltell ... 20157
Mr. Morneau ... 20157
Mr. Deltell ... 20157
Mr. Morneau ... 20157

Canadian Heritage
Mr. Nantel ... 20157
Mr. Casey (Charlottetown) ... 20157
Ms. Blaney (North Island—Powell River) ... 20157
Mr. Casey (Charlottetown) ... 20157

Health
Mr. Oliver ... 20158
Ms. Petitpas Taylor ... 20158

Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship
Mr. Paul-Hus ... 20158
Mr. Cormier ... 20158
Mr. Paul-Hus ... 20158
Mr. Goodale ... 20158

Sport
Ms. Harder ... 20158
Ms. Duncan (Etobicoke North) ... 20158
Mrs. Kusie ... 20159
Ms. Duncan (Etobicoke North) ... 20159

Veterans Affairs
Mr. Johns ... 20159
Mr. O'Regan ... 20159

Employment Insurance
Ms. Sansoucy ... 20159
Mr. Duclos ... 20159

Democratic Reform
Mr. Richards ... 20159
Ms. Gould ... 20159
Mr. Richards ... 20159
Ms. Gould ... 20160

Public Safety
Mr. Clarke ... 20160
Mr. DeCourcey ... 20160

Pensions
Mrs. Mendès ... 20160
Mr. Duclos ... 20160

Ethics
Mr. Doherty ... 20160
Mr. Beech ... 20160

Canada Post
Ms. Mathyssen ... 20160
Ms. Qualtrough ... 20161

Indigenous Affairs
Mr. Longfield ... 20161
Mrs. Philpott ... 20161

Employment
Mr. Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis) ... 20161
Ms. Hajdu ... 20161

Public Safety
Mr. Fortin ... 20161
Mr. DeCourcey ... 20161
Mr. Marcil ... 20161
Mr. DeCourcey ... 20161

Infrastructure
Mr. Weir ... 20162
Mr. Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Sœurs) ... 20162

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Budget Implementation Act, 2018, No. 1
Bill C-74. Report stage ... 20162
Motions Nos. 1 to 46 negatived ... 20163
Motions Nos. 47 to 67 negatived ... 20164
Motions Nos. 68, 70 to 72, 74 to 94, 96, and 98 to 119 negatived ... 20165
Motions Nos. 69, 73, 95, and 97 negatived ... 20166
Motions Nos. 120 to 185 negatived ... 20167
Motions Nos. 186 to 198 negatived ... 20168
Motions Nos. 199 to 201 negatived ... 20169
Motions Nos. 202 to 213 negatived ... 20170
Motions Nos. 214 to 219 negatived ... 20171
Motions Nos. 220 and 221 negatived ... 20172

Motion No. 222 negatived 20173
Motions Nos. 223 and 224 negatived 20174
Motions Nos. 225 to 230 negatived 20175
Motions Nos. 231 to 244 negatived 20176
Motions Nos. 245 and 246 negatived 20177
Motions Nos. 247 to 249 negatived 20178
Motions Nos. 250 to 256 negatived 20179
Motions Nos. 257 to 264 negatived 20180
Motions Nos. 265 to 267 negatived 20181
Motions Nos. 268 to 283 negatived 20182
Motions Nos. 284 to 296 negatived 20183
Motions Nos. 297 to 309 negatived 20184
Motions Nos. 310, 316, 317, 324 and 329 negatived 20185
Motions Nos. 311 to 315, 318 to 323, 325 to 328, and 330 to 358 negatived 20187
Motion No. 359 negatived 20188
Motion No. 360 negatived 20189
Motions Nos. 361 to 402 negatived 20190
Motions Nos. 403 to 409 negatived 20191
Mr. Morneau 20191
Motion for concurrence 20191
Motion agreed to 20192
Bill C-47. Report Stage 20192
Motion No. 1 negatived 20193
Motion No. 2 negatived 20194
Mr. Goodale (for the Minister of Foreign Affairs) 20194
Motion for concurrence 20194
Motion agreed to 20196

Federal Sustainable Development Act

Bill C-57. Third reading 20196
Motion agreed to 20197
(Bill read the third time and passed) 20197

Business of Supply

Opposition Motion—United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples

Motion 20197
Division on motion deferred 20197

Privilege

Rights of Members in Raising Points of Order

The Speaker 20197

Published under the authority of the Speaker of
the House of Commons

SPEAKER'S PERMISSION

The proceedings of the House of Commons and its Committees are hereby made available to provide greater public access. The parliamentary privilege of the House of Commons to control the publication and broadcast of the proceedings of the House of Commons and its Committees is nonetheless reserved. All copyrights therein are also reserved.

Reproduction of the proceedings of the House of Commons and its Committees, in whole or in part and in any medium, is hereby permitted provided that the reproduction is accurate and is not presented as official. This permission does not extend to reproduction, distribution or use for commercial purpose of financial gain. Reproduction or use outside this permission or without authorization may be treated as copyright infringement in accordance with the *Copyright Act*. Authorization may be obtained on written application to the Office of the Speaker of the House of Commons.

Reproduction in accordance with this permission does not constitute publication under the authority of the House of Commons. The absolute privilege that applies to the proceedings of the House of Commons does not extend to these permitted reproductions. Where a reproduction includes briefs to a Committee of the House of Commons, authorization for reproduction may be required from the authors in accordance with the *Copyright Act*.

Nothing in this permission abrogates or derogates from the privileges, powers, immunities and rights of the House of Commons and its Committees. For greater certainty, this permission does not affect the prohibition against impeaching or questioning the proceedings of the House of Commons in courts or otherwise. The House of Commons retains the right and privilege to find users in contempt of Parliament if a reproduction or use is not in accordance with this permission.

Also available on the House of Commons website at the following address: http://www.ourcommons.ca

Publié en conformité de l'autorité
du Président de la Chambre des communes

PERMISSION DU PRÉSIDENT

Les délibérations de la Chambre des communes et de ses comités sont mises à la disposition du public pour mieux le renseigner. La Chambre conserve néanmoins son privilège parlementaire de contrôler la publication et la diffusion des délibérations et elle possède tous les droits d'auteur sur celles-ci.

Il est permis de reproduire les délibérations de la Chambre et de ses comités, en tout ou en partie, sur n'importe quel support, pourvu que la reproduction soit exacte et qu'elle ne soit pas présentée comme version officielle. Il n'est toutefois pas permis de reproduire, de distribuer ou d'utiliser les délibérations à des fins commerciales visant la réalisation d'un profit financier. Toute reproduction ou utilisation non permise ou non formellement autorisée peut être considérée comme une violation du droit d'auteur aux termes de la *Loi sur le droit d'auteur*. Une autorisation formelle peut être obtenue sur présentation d'une demande écrite au Bureau du Président de la Chambre.

La reproduction conforme à la présente permission ne constitue pas une publication sous l'autorité de la Chambre. Le privilège absolu qui s'applique aux délibérations de la Chambre ne s'étend pas aux reproductions permises. Lorsqu'une reproduction comprend des mémoires présentés à un comité de la Chambre, il peut être nécessaire d'obtenir de leurs auteurs l'autorisation de les reproduire, conformément à la *Loi sur le droit d'auteur*.

La présente permission ne porte pas atteinte aux privilèges, pouvoirs, immunités et droits de la Chambre et de ses comités. Il est entendu que cette permission ne touche pas l'interdiction de contester ou de mettre en cause les délibérations de la Chambre devant les tribunaux ou autrement. La Chambre conserve le droit et le privilège de déclarer l'utilisateur coupable d'outrage au Parlement lorsque la reproduction ou l'utilisation n'est pas conforme à la présente permission.

Aussi disponible sur le site Web de la Chambre des communes à l'adresse suivante : http://www.noscommunes.ca

HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 148 • NUMBER 307 • 1st SESSION • 42nd PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Monday, June 4, 2018
(Part B)

Speaker: The Honourable Geoff Regan

CONTENTS

(Table of Contents appears at back of this issue.)

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Monday, June 4, 2018

[*Continuation of proceedings from Part A*]

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36(8) I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the government's response to three petitions.

* * *

● (1910)

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

TRANSPORT, INFRASTRUCTURE AND COMMUNITIES

Mr. Vance Badawey (Niagara Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is my honour to present, in both official languages, the 24th report of the Standing Committee on Transport, Infrastructure and Communities, entitled "Main Estimates 2018-19".

[*Translation*]

PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

Hon. Larry Bagnell (Yukon, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the 64th report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs entitled "Code of Conduct for Members of the House of Commons: Sexual Harassment Between Members".

[*English*]

I would like to thank all the witnesses from the private sector, who appeared before the committee, for their valuable input. I would also like to thank our law clerk and parliamentary counsel, Philippe Dufresne, and chief human resources officer, Pierre Parent, for the excellent support they provided throughout the process. The following staff and their offices also contributed significantly to the development of the revised code: Carolyn LeCheminant-Chandy, Wendy Gordon, Alexandra Schorah, Gisèle Isimbi, Charles Feldman, Sarah Pentney, Jean-François Martin, Valérie Boudreau, Myriam Beauparlant, Sophie Hart, and Marc Gagnon.

I would like to congratulate the members of the committee. People think it is an excellent report. The members worked totally in a non-partisan fashion to come up with this report.

● (1915)

CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

Mr. Randeep Sarai (Surrey Centre, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the 19th report of the Standing Committee on Citizenship and Immigration, entitled "Main Estimates 2018-19: Vote 1 under Immigration and Refugee Board".

* * *

CANADA ELECTIONS ACT

Mr. Blaine Calkins (Red Deer—Lacombe, CPC) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-406, An Act to amend the Canada Elections Act (foreign contributions).

He said: Madam Speaker, I am certainly pleased to stand in my place. This is the third time in four parliaments that I have been able to have a private member's business item. I am taking this opportunity to address something that every patriot in Canada ought to be concerned about, which is the influence of foreign money coming into third-party organizations and advertising during our federal election campaigns.

I am certainly glad to have a seconder, my colleague from St. Albert—Edmonton, who is also very knowledgeable on this issue. I look forward to the healthy debate on this most important piece of private members' business.

(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed)

* * *

[*Translation*]

INSTRUCTION TO COMMITTEE ON BILL C-71

Mr. Pierre Paul-Hus (Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles, CPC) moved:

> That it be an instruction to the Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security that, during its consideration of Bill C-71, An Act to amend certain Acts and Regulations in relation to firearms, the Committee be granted the power to travel throughout Canada to hear testimony from interested parties and that the necessary staff do accompany the Committee.

He said: Madam Speaker, I will be sharing my time with the member for Saskatoon—Grasswood.

I am extremely pleased to rise in the House today to speak to this motion. We are asking for this travel time for a number of reasons. First, our Liberal friends reduced to a minimum the number of committee meetings to debate this bill. Several stakeholders have not received an invitation to appear, including first nations, unfortunately.

Are we to believe that it did not occur to the Prime Minister, who says that his government is inclusive, open and transparent, to consult first nations on the new gun registry that he wants to introduce? Who hunts as much as the first nations? Who is as close to nature as the first nations? Who relies on guns for their subsistence as much as the first nations?

I cannot stay silent on this subject while the Liberals stubbornly persist in the belief that they can reduce crime with a bill that does not even go after criminals. This is unbelievable. They obviously have not learned a thing from their past mistakes.

Young people and new Canadians who were not here when the Jean Chrétien Liberals introduced the gun registry may not know that the idea was not only poorly conceived, but also an attack on law-abiding Canadians. When the initiative was launched, the minister said it would cost about $2 million, but it ended up costing almost $2 billion.

The Conservatives of Canada believe that the safety of Canadians must be the top priority of any government. The Liberals are not to be trusted when it comes to firearms legislation. Instead of cracking down on criminals, they treat law-abiding gun owners like criminals.

When we were in office from 2006 to 2015, we worked tirelessly to keep Canadians safe. We made promises and we kept them. For example, we passed the Common Sense Firearms Licensing Act, which simplified the licensing regime while strengthening firearms possession prohibitions for people convicted of domestic violence offences.

Furthermore, we passed the Tackling Violent Crime Act, which provides for mandatory prison sentences for serious firearms offences and stricter bail provisions for those accused of serious offences involving firearms.

We also passed the Act to amend the Criminal Code regarding organized crime and protection of justice system participants, which provides police officers and judges with new tools to fight organized crime, including new sentences for the reckless use of a firearm.

These are just some of the measures we took.

The government is already halfway through its mandate, and it is faltering. It lacks courage to keep its promises. The proposed legislation does not contain a single measure to deal with the criminal and unauthorized possession of firearms, nor does it address gang violence. The Liberals think that violence and gun crimes can be fixed by going after law-abiding citizens instead of combatting gangs and organized crime.

For the most part, this bill does little to nothing to improve public safety. However, it imposes a number of new conditions on law-abiding gun owners. On this side of the House, we know that law-abiding citizens are not the problem.

I can give other examples of promises the Liberals have made on firearms issues that have either been broken or simply remain unfulfilled. For instance, they promised the provinces and territories $100 million a year to help fight the illegal firearms trade. Where is that money?

On top of that, the Liberals have yet to implement the marking regulations on imported firearms, even though they promised to do so as soon as they took office.

The Liberals have also forgotten their promise to invest in technologies that would help customs officers detect and intercept illegal arms entering Canada from the United States.

Those are some concrete gun control measures. I would urge the government to leave hunters and sport shooters alone.

Finally, the Liberals promised they would not bring back the long gun registry, and yet that is exactly what they are doing with Bill C-71.

● (1920)

Yes, the wording of the bill opens the door to another registry. It is very subtle, but what is proposed is very clear.

As I said earlier, the bill does nothing to deal with street gangs, trace illegal weapons coming into the country, or combat organized crime. The Prime Minister needs to decide who the real threat is. Is it street gangs or farmers? Is it sport shooters or organized crime?

An hon. member: It is the farmers they are going after.

Mr. Pierre Paul-Hus: Yes, sir.

To Canadians, the problem is obvious. Why is the government wasting so many resources to control law-abiding citizens? Why is the Prime Minister obsessed with a segment of the population that has always obeyed the law? In one way or another, the Prime Minister has demonstrated a clear lack of judgment in this regard.

I have another example. I recently read an article in the Quebec City newspaper *Le Soleil* about what is known as the dark web. Journalist Jim Bronskill explained that criminals are hiding in the darker corners of the Internet, using cryptocurrencies that are hard to trace and coming up with ways to illegally sell firearms in Canada. The RCMP and the media are aware of this, and I am sure the Minister of Public Safety is too. However, Bill C-71 contains no measures to combat that crime. Why?

That is one of the reasons why we are saying that Bill C-71 should be studied. The time for debate in the House at second reading was cut short and the bill was sent to committee. The Conservatives asked for at least 21 witnesses and it would have taken seven meetings to complete the work. That was cut down to four meetings and seven witnesses.

Right now, everything is being done to keep us from doing our job properly. The Liberals are doing this so they can claim that the Conservatives do not want to talk about firearms, because they do not want to hear about how they are wrong. What they say is not true. We are law-abiding people, and we work with law-abiding people. Talking about firearms does not prevent us from doing our job. The Liberals are preventing us from doing our job.

Bill C-71 includes no legislation that would tackle criminals, and its preamble contains misleading statements, such as the alarming crime statistics cited by the Minister of Public Safety. When he tabled the bill, the minister claimed there had been a major increase in crime in Canada, but the figures he was using as his benchmark were from 2013. The crime rate has remained fairly consistent over the past 15 years. In 2013, a Conservative government was in office, and crime was very low. The minister used those numbers to claim that crime increased in 2014 and 2015. That is some numbers fudging worthy of a clever accountant. He tried to influence public opinion by claiming there had been an increase, which is completely false.

There are several signs that the government only wants to pass the law as quickly as possible, before the end of the parliamentary session, to boast that it has done something about firearms and that it has done good work. In reality, it is doing absolutely nothing other than penalizing hunters and sport shooters. We said this when the bill was introduced. Now that it has been studied in committee, I stand by that. That is why we need to travel across Canada to consult Canadians, especially first nations.

First nations have said that they are completely opposed to this bill at present. They are even saying that it might be unconstitutional. They claim that they were not consulted and that the law does not apply to them.

There is therefore a major problem. As the public safety critic, I cannot fathom or agree to voting on a bill that will once again affect honest citizens. Criminals will not be affected. Indigenous peoples will not be consulted and will rightly complain that the bill is unconstitutional. Why was the work not done properly the first time? There must be adequate consultation and the work must not be done willy-nilly.

● (1925)

[*English*]

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, it is a bit disappointing that the Conservative opposition continues to try to convince Canadians that something is happening with Bill C-71, when in fact nothing is happening in regard to any type of a long-gun registry. The Conservatives continue to attempt to fool Canadians. They are out of touch with the reality and expectations of Canadians in regard to the whole issue of Bill C-71.

Why does the Conservative Party continue to say this is about a gun registry when it is just not the case? We know that. Whether it is the minister, the parliamentary secretary, or members of the House, they have consistently said that the bill has nothing to do with a gun registry, yet the Conservatives time and time again try to convey an untruth.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pierre Paul-Hus: Madam Speaker, first I want to thank the hon. member for his tone, which is quieter than usual.

We are not trying to mislead Canadians. On the contrary, we have both feet on the ground. We have said from the start that the Liberals are doing nothing but upsetting hunters and sport shooters and doing nothing about criminals. After the handful of speeches we were able to make and the few committee meetings we had, it is clear that Bill C-71 makes it mandatory to register guns and provide reference numbers. That information will be entered into a computer of some business somewhere and then forwarded to the government.

If that is not a registry, then what is it? In the meantime, the government is doing nothing about the dark web or the real criminals who sell weapons or enter Canada illegally. That is what people are telling me does not work.

[*English*]

Mr. Glen Motz (Medicine Hat—Cardston—Warner, CPC): Madam Speaker, I am curious to know the member's perspective. We heard the Toronto Police Service say that Bill C-71 does not address gun crime directly. Could the member explain what he thinks the bill does and why the Liberals are in such a hurry to get it passed?

● (1930)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pierre Paul-Hus: Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for his excellent question. I wish I had an answer for him, since the purpose of our motion and our presence here this evening is to call for more time to do things properly.

With the little time and few meetings we had, we were unable to get any responses providing justification for Bill C-71. I think this bill is a flash in the pan, fireworks in la-la land just to have Canadians believe that the Liberals are regulating guns and that they are good and nice people. Their bill is no good. We need time to make things right.

[*English*]

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, this evening, we were hoping to debate Bill C-69. It is on the government's agenda. Why does my colleague and friend across believe that the Conservative Party voted for a number of hours today and then brought in a motion of this nature? It seems to me they do not want to debate Bill C-69. Do they support the bill or not?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pierre Paul-Hus: Madam Speaker, I am not the leader of the opposition, I am the public safety critic. I am here to talk about Bill C-71 and the time I need to do my work on this topic. I would ask my colleague to direct that question to the appropriate person.

[*English*]

Mr. Kevin Waugh (Saskatoon—Grasswood, CPC): Madam Speaker, today I rise to speak on Bill C-71, an act to amend certain acts and regulations in relation to firearms.

While the Liberals tell us this bill is all about tackling gun violence and violent gang activity, we see nothing at all in it even remotely touching on these issues. Instead, the Liberals are planning to unload even more excessive regulations on law-abiding gun owners, treating them as if they were real criminals. Once again, as we have seen all too often in this place, with the policies and the bill that the Liberal government has introduced, they have their priorities mixed up and are punishing hard-working, law-abiding Canadians instead of addressing the problems facing people across this country.

With respect to gun violence, this bill quite noticeably leaves the problems of gang violence, illegal gun trading, and rural crime totally unresolved. It is shameful. The Liberals do not touch on these very important issues at all. How then can they claim the bill accomplishes anything other than making criminals out of law-abiding gun owners across this country.

The first troubling thing about Bill C-71 is that it does nothing at all, as I mentioned, to address gang gun violence in this country. While the bill seeks to implement mandatory registries or transfers of non-restricted firearms to be kept by businesses and other firearms vendors, which by the way is a practice already being done voluntarily by many businesses in this country, it does not propose solutions to the problems of gang violence and criminal gun violence.

These are very worrisome problems that deserve a real response from the government, instead of a bill demonizing law-abiding gun owners. Public Safety Canada notes that shooting-related homicides remain a chronic problem in this country even though overall crime rates have gone down compared to previous decades.

We take particular note that Public Safety Canada has specifically highlighted the enormous role that gang-related gun violence plays in this national trend. The department states:

> Gang-related murders involving guns is no exception. In 2016 alone, police reported 141 gang-related homicides, 45 more than in 2015.

The department also states that gun violence is increasing in rural areas. We certainly know that in my province of Saskatchewan. In Canada, three out of 10 violent gun crimes happen outside a major city. Overall, the territories and my province of Saskatchewan have the highest rates of firearms-related violent crimes.

Criminals are not registering their guns by legally obtaining them in gun shops. They are not phoning the office of the chief firearms officer before transporting their guns in their cars. Gang members are not the ones who are going to be following the regulations outlined in Bill C-71.

This bill will only be a major thorn in the side of law-abiding gun owners and, as a result, it will do nothing to prevent the criminal gun violence being perpetuated by gangs and is the occurring increasingly in rural Canada. In Saskatoon alone, gun violence is on the rise, according to the Saskatoon Police Service.

The Saskatoon Police Service says that shootings are often gang related. Where are gang members getting their guns from? That is the million dollar question. Are they walking into gun stores and going through an extensive background check? Are they making sure their purchases are kept in the 20-year business registries, which under this bill will hold detailed information, including their personal information, the reference number of their purchase, and the serial number of their firearm?

Not according to the Saskatoon police and their Superintendent David Haye, who says that the firearms police are recovering generally come from break and enters.

● (1935)

Unsurprisingly, when it comes to guns, criminals do not act like law-abiding gun owners. Criminals act like criminals. We know that, but the Liberals seem to be missing this consideration in Bill C-71. Piling a backdoor gun registry onto law-abiding gun owners by mandating that gun sellers keep a 20-year-long registry of all their transfers for non-restricted firearms does nothing at all to prevent gun crime, precisely because of the way criminals act, not the way those who are following the rules do. The Liberals expect, with the bill before us, that gang members will suddenly begin acting like law-abiding gun owners as soon as it is passed. It is an absurd assumption, and it proves once again that the Liberal government has its priorities totally backwards when it comes to the very important issues of gun violence and organized crime in this country.

The second really worrisome thing about the bill is that it would increase the regulatory burden on responsible law-abiding gun owners without providing any real benefit for Canadians in return. Canadian gun laws are already vast and extensive.

In order to legally purchase a gun in this country a person must have a possession and acquisition licence. They go through extensive background checks and firearm safety training before they can even get a licence. They must submit references to the RCMP from those who can vouch for their suitability as a gun owner. They must then submit this information to a photo guarantor who can confirm that the photo sent by the licence candidate is completely accurate. Once a Canadian acquires a possession and acquisition licence, they are then subject to an automatic daily background check that is run through police and courthouse databases. The RCMP notes that these daily checks determine if there is any new information indicating that a licence holder may have become a public safety risk.

Nonetheless, the Liberals still want to implement a backdoor registry. We all know that they do. They are still determined to treat law-abiding Canadian gun owners as if they are the problem, and as if they are the ones responsible for gun violence in this country. This is totally unacceptable, and it is unfair to Canadians who obey the laws, such as hunters and sport shooters.

None of the measures proposed in the bill even tackle the issue of violent gun crime. The bill would simply impose additional burdens upon respectable gun owners. In fact, a report published by Statistics Canada back in 2012 found that only 4% of administrative firearm violations occurring in this country that year, and outside of Quebec, were connected to gun violence. The Liberals did not understand when Jean Chrétien was the prime minister that a gun registry did not respond to the problem of gun violence. The Liberals still do not understand that in 2018.

When will the Liberal government finally make the distinction between law-abiding gun owners and the criminals who do not follow these rules? When will the Liberal government actually take meaningful steps to protect Canadians by introducing real legislation to combat gun violence and criminal activity by gangs?

That said, I move:

That the motion be amended by inserting after the word "parties" the following: ", provided that the travel does not exceed 85 calendar days."

● (1940)

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have heard a great deal of opposition from the Conservative Party in regard to Bill C-71. I believe it is the only party in the House. The New Democrats, the Greens, the government of the day, and I expect even the representative from the CCF have ultimately recognized the value of Bill C-71 as a piece of legislation that is needed.

The Prime Minister talked about the importance of the issue. It is now before us. I am not 100% sure that it is at committee, but I believe it is. Let us avoid this backdoor stuff, because that is not reality. Within the current legislation, what is it specifically that is so upsetting to the Conservative Party?

Mr. Kevin Waugh: Mr. Speaker, during my speech, I talked about it. The Liberals are singling out law-abiding citizens in this country, and that is a problem. I only have to talk about Allan Rock in the House when we talk about the gun registry. Two million dollars turned into $2 billion very quickly. We are very concerned about this. We know where the government is going with this bill. We see another registry. This is totally what the government is doing.

Why has it not consulted with first nation groups? The hon. member talked about that. It is another disturbing point, because day in and day out, all the Liberals talk about is the indigenous people and how important they are to this country, yet they have not consulted them on Bill C-71.

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, I thank my hon. Conservative colleague for his expression of concern, because I have been quite baffled, having read Bill C-71, as to why the Conservative Party is alarming people who are legal gun owners, lawful citizens of Canada. I understand it better now, but when I read the legislation, it does not add up.

I think this legislation as very valuable. I ask my hon. colleague if he disagrees that it is not better to ensure that when we do checks on someone's history, in terms of mental health and whether we would want such an individual to own a gun, that we do not stop at the current legislation, which only goes back five years, but that we actually look at the lifetime record of an individual and decide whether that person should be able to buy a firearm. Surely a lot of Conservative families and communities would feel very relieved to know that there was a lifetime check, not just the current five years.

● (1945)

Mr. Kevin Waugh: Mr. Speaker, we are all for public safety. Twenty years is a long time. Many businesses change hands. We all know that when we buy a gun from Cabela's or somewhere else in this country. We know that gangs in this country will not walk into a store and register their names or do all the things they have to do. This is what we want to have corrected in this country through Bill C-71. Law-abiding citizens are being picked on in the bill, while gang members are not. Law-abiding citizens have for years and decades been law-abiding. They are the safest with guns, yet the bill does little to give them any support whatsoever.

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, for decades leading up to 1995, retailers selling guns had to keep track of the transactions. It was common sense. It was not a registry of any kind. We did it for a very long time, and it disappeared with the long-gun registry and the repeal of the long-gun registry. It looked like a mistake, and it is being corrected now.

Does the member and his party think that we should not keep track of the sales of guns in any way, shape, or form?

Mr. Kevin Waugh: Mr. Speaker, I think we should. I am wondering about gang members, though, because we do not see any legislation that targets them. That is the biggest issue with the bill. Law-abiding citizens have been law-abiding forever in this country. Now we have gang members that are not registering guns. The bill does not talk about them, so we are upset about the bill.

The other issue we are upset about is not talking to first nations. The committee did not hear enough information from first nations. We think this is important. They have a big say on this too.

Mr. Mark Holland (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have many debates in this chamber on which there are genuine differences of opinion, when there are two different perspectives, and perhaps empirical fact does not lend itself to clearly give evidence as to which side might be right. When we have those debates, of course, we hope that those debates are informed by facts and information, that there is not distortion, and that games are not played. Unfortunately, being in the business of politics, sometimes that happens. Few times have I seen it done with such force and vigour and as over the top as on Bill C-71.

The bill in question was actually part of the platform the party ran on in the last election, from which we had a vigorous debate across this country. It was proceeded by, over the last couple of years, discussions in every corner of this country, including with first nations chiefs, chiefs of police, the firearms community, and others about how exactly the promises we made in the election platform might come to bear, might come to pass. As a result of those consultations, which I will go through in my discussion, we changed a number of elements in our platform in response to the feedback we got. It should be understood that not only was there an unbelievable amount of dialogue on this but that the imperative for action could be no more clear.

We do not hold Bill C-71 out as a panacea, as something that is going to fix all the terrible problems that deal with gun violence. By the way, gun violence manifests itself in many forms. It can manifest itself in suicide. It can manifest itself in gang violence. It can manifest itself in domestic violence. In every single one of those categories since 2013, we have seen as much as a two-thirds increase in firearms violence. Some in committee have passed that off as not a big deal. Numbers go up, and numbers go down. The reality is that for decades, when it came to gun-related injuries, gun-related violence, the numbers were on a downward trend. Since 2013, we have seen a spike way up. As sensible legislators, we should pay attention to that. The idea that we would dismiss it as not a big deal is abhorrent to me.

I will speak for a few moments about specifically why it is so important and why this bill addresses some of those things. Then I will speak about many of the other things our government is doing to try to address the broader problem.

I will start with background checks. Background checks are not a new concept to this House in terms of going back five years. In fact, it was former minister Jason Kenney who proposed that background checks should go past five years. We agree, and that is why it is in this legislation.

Some may ask why that is important. Let us take a domestic violence situation. Let us take a situation where a young woman is in a relationship with a man with a violent past. There may be violence in that relationship, but she is afraid to come forward, and she stays in that abusive relationship, sadly. However, eventually she escapes. She leaves. The man, outraged, purchases a gun, legally, because he has no connection to the criminal market, and then kills his former girlfriend. That happens, very sadly, all too often in this country. Someone who has a violent history, particularly a violent history against women, should not be able to legally purchase a gun.

Some have asked what happens if that person had a minor transgression in the past. The legislation is very clear that we are dealing with circumstances that specifically deal with a history of violence or mental instability. These are individuals who clearly should not be able to get weapons. Just because that did not happen in a five-year window does not mean that if it is longer than that, they should be able to purchase weapons.

The committee heard very moving and compelling testimony from Alison Irons, who lost her daughter Lindsay. She talked very specifically about this exact circumstance. It particularly hit home, because Alison was a resident of Ajax.

● (1950)

I have look at other circumstances and have talked, as I did as a critic and I do now as a parliamentary secretary, again and again about circumstances where people who had violent histories that went back further than five years were able to walk in and a buy gun and then shot someone dead. Now members tell me that this legislation does not have force or effect. That is absolute nonsense.

The reality is that background checks are essential, not just in those circumstances but in circumstances in which people are in a situation of self-harm and have a history of hurting themselves and of general instability. We have an obligation to make sure that those people also do not own firearms.

Another item in the bill, which, confusingly, the Conservatives have tried to conflate as a registry, is the requirement that stores keep records on the guns they sell. There are two things that are very important about that. One of the things we added as a change from what we moved in the platform was to say that for police to get that information, they would require judicial access. That means that for police to get the records of the store, they would have to demonstrate that they were going to help them solve a crime. Why on earth would anyone be opposed to that? How on earth could anyone say that would be a bad idea?

Let me give members some examples. Let us say that someone commits a crime. A weapon is found. Police go back to the store and ask where the gun came from. Who was it was sold to? Right now, some stores do not keep records. Most do. In fact, in the United States, this requirement has been in effect for decades.

When the police walk into the store and ask for that record, if the store clerk says that they do not keep records, that is the end of the search and the end of the investigation. Clearly, it makes sense for those records to be kept so that we know what happened to those firearms in an instance when they were used in a crime.

The notion that somehow it is a registry, when the only way the government could ever see it is with judicial access when it would help solve a crime, is not only misleading but is playing politics with crime. It is beneath this place. To send out Facebook ads saying that there is a new registry coming, based on this flimsy nonsense, instead of debating the actual public safety merits of the bill, is abhorrent.

Another element of the bill that has been discussed is the ATT. We did talk during the campaign about an authorization to transport. Let us remember that we are speaking about restricted and prohibited weapons. We are not talking about hunting rifles. We are not talking about shotguns. We are not talking about unrestricted weapons. We are talking about semi-automatic weapons that are restricted, we are talking about handguns, and we are talking about people who are allowed to own prohibited weapons. It is a very limited class of firearms. What we said during the campaign was that any time people put those in the car and drive them someplace, they had better prove that they have a reason for where they are taking them.

We listened to the firearms community, and many said that if they were taking them to their gun range, it would be pretty clear where they were taking them, and they should not have to get an ATT. By the way, that constitutes a little more than 90% of the cases. It was pretty reasonable, so we made a change. We backed off and said we were only going to require gun owners to have that authorization to transport if they were taking their guns somewhere other than the gun range. That leaves about 10%, 8%, or maybe 7% of the cases, depending on the year. In this instance, we are again talking about someone who is transporting a restricted or prohibited weapon.

Some have said that police cannot pull someone over because a weapon is in the car. I can tell members that I have talked with police officers who say that they have pulled folks over for one thing and have noticed that there was a prohibited or restricted weapon in the car, and they have asked where they were taking it. Under the current regime, there are a number of places people can say they are taking it. In fact, a person could drive every day of the week with a prohibited or restricted weapon in the car and never have to have a reason or excuse for it.

This legislation says that in those limited circumstances in which a person is taking a weapon somewhere other than the range, it will require an ATT. By the way, it is free, and it can be sent electronically so that people can just show it on their phones.

It is important, as a government, to send a message that if a person has a prohibited or restricted firearm, it is a very special privilege, and if a person is going to be out in the world with that, there are a very limited number of places a person can take it.

● (1955)

By having clear legislation on the requirement to have an authorization to transport, that sends a clear message that one cannot drive around with a restricted or prohibited weapon anywhere one wants to go. I think that is a reasonable way of working with law-abiding firearms owners in making sure we do not have thugs who can just throw weapons in the back of their car and drive anywhere they want to go.

An hon. member: That's what thugs do.

Mr. Mark Holland: What thugs do is to make sure they are able to keep weapons in their car and not have to answer any questions. That is what they are going to do. They are going to put the weapons in the car and drive wherever they go. They know that if they are pulled over by a police officer, all they have to do is list one of a million different places to explain where they are going. That is what this legislation changes.

On purchase verification, which is very important, today when we are dealing with people who are not gun store owners but individuals who are selling to another individual, there is no way of being sure that the individuals in question have an up-to-date and valid PAL. As an example, if somebody has committed a series of crimes and they still have their card, they can purchase that gun without any check. Therefore, all this legislation requires one to do is to make a very quick call. It costs nothing. No information is given about the firearm, except to say, "Hey, I am going to sell; this person is going to buy. Is everybody okay here? Is the PAL up to date? Is this person allowed to own a gun? Am I allowed to sell a gun?" If it's yes, then away one goes.

That then allows a person to sell 10 or 20 weapons and there is no information about the firearm. However, it makes sure that the people who are buying and selling are doing so legitimately and are in fact law-abiding gun owners. What we are finding is that, very sadly, many of the firearms that are now being sold on our streets are being sold not because they are being smuggled or snuck into Canada, but they are being sold from within Canada, from within the existing stock of guns. Unfortunately, that means that a lot of people are taking law-abiding firearms owners' weapons and then selling them to gangs.

These are statistics. These are facts. It has been explained very clearly by the chiefs of police, who by the way support this bill. They say it is an important change, and it is needed for public safety. I put some stock in what the chiefs of police tell us. I do not think they go around saying that public safety changes are important for no reason.

The other thing that comes up is the RCMP classification of weapons. Some have said that there should be a check on the RCMP. Let us be very clear: that check is the Criminal Code. The Criminal Code of Canada very clearly prescribes in this country what is a prohibited weapon, a restricted weapon, and an unrestricted weapon. It is up to the RCMP to interpret that legislation. In fact, they do it about 8,000 times a year. The idea that politicians could overturn that effectively means the provisions we put into the Criminal Code have no meaning.

It is our job as legislators to describe at the highest level what those classifications should be in terms of those prohibited, restricted, and unrestricted weapons. It is the job of the RCMP, as an independent arm's-length arbiter, to then enforce it. It is not up to politicians to say that this particular semi-automatic weapon seems to be popular, so let us just override the RCMP. The RCMP has an important job to do, and it is important that we let them do that job. That is why we made that commitment in the platform.

I mentioned earlier in my speech that these are not the only things we are doing to make Canada's streets and our communities safer. There is a litany of things we are doing to try to improve public safety, but it is a piece of the puzzle. For example, when we had the guns and gangs summit in Ottawa, which was hosted by the minister, and that I and many members of this House were privileged to be a part of, we talked about the money we are putting into communities, escalating to $100 million a year, to help build the capacity to deal with what gun and gang violence looks like in each individual community.

We saw that reality in Ajax, my home community, where unfortunately there was a shooting at our ribfest. It is unheard of for us to see this kind of gun violence in our neck of the woods. The realities of what we can do to change the problem of guns and gangs, suicides, and domestic violence differ very much from what we would see in a community, let us say, Red Deer, Alberta, or Summerside, P.E.I. Those communities need to be given the funds, resources, and support to be able to build those solutions from the ground up.

● (2000)

I say that as a former member of the Police Services Board in Durham region. I so often saw self-evident solutions that needed to be funded and supported, but the box we had to contort ourselves in was created in Ottawa or Queen's Park. It was frankly completely disconnected from what was actually going to work on the ground in those communities. That is one of the reasons why our biggest push is for support at the community level, to give them the capacity and strength they need to be able to tackle this problem. Of course, we have done this in addition to a whole host of measures to improve border security to stop the illegal smuggling of weapons across the border.

This is something that has been brought out in testimony at committee, and I want to say it here today. It is unfortunate that every time we talk about firearms, violence, and death, we do not talk about suicide. We only talk about gangs. We do not talk about the tremendous problem we have with domestic violence as well. We have to come at this from every angle. That means the debate we have on these issues must be worthy of the weight of the issue.

That means when people send a Facebook ad pretending that there is a new registry, that dishonest action is unworthy of the debate we must have in this place. I know that for every single one of us, every member, our hearts are ripped apart when we see gun violence tear into our community. Whether it is somebody walking into a mosque in Sainte-Foy and tearing down the congregants who were just trying to pray, or a domestic violence situation in my own riding where a father killed a mother and his own children, or somebody who commits suicide in our community, the weight of what is in front of us is important. It is something that obviously I am very passionate about.

I hope that folks can see, as well, that it means we have to take action, but at the same time we must protect and support law-abiding gun owners. That is why none of these measures cost anything. Most of these measures, in fact almost in their entirety, only deal with restricted or prohibited firearms, the most limited class of firearms. Unfortunately, most of the debate against it has gone into hyperbole with respect to things that have nothing to do with this bill.

Therefore, do I think that we should go 85 days touring around on something that was in the platform and requires immediate action when we have so much other work to do? No. It is time to pass this bill. It is time to move forward on the other collective actions we can do to make our communities safe. I look forward to doing exactly that.

● (2005)

Mrs. Cathay Wagantall (Yorkton—Melville, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate what the member had to say. However, I have just come back from a trip across Canada with Veterans Affairs, visiting many indigenous communities across Canada. I noticed that the public safety advisory committee on firearms has no one from that community on it. We know the extensive concerns around firearms in those communities. I am wondering if that concerns him that they are not represented at all on that advisory committee.

Mr. Mark Holland: Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity of speaking before the advisory committee on firearms, which we are trying to make more representative. Unfortunately, for a very long time, it was not representative at all. We want to make sure that we have that diversity of opinion. Certainly, we have engaged in talks with the chiefs across the country on this specific issue. I think that making sure there is a better voice on the advisory committee is a good idea. It is something that I am committed to finding a path toward. I think that advisory body needs to be as representative as possible of all the different perspectives: public health, firearms use, community, victims, technical experts, policing, and of course our indigenous communities. I think the more representative in its view, the more representatively it collects that information, the better it will do its job.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pierre Paul-Hus (Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we have had confirmation that first nations were not consulted and that they even consider Bill C-71 unconstitutional.

Can the parliamentary secretary confirm that he has the approval of first nations and that first nations people are going to comply with Bill C-71?

[*English*]

Mr. Mark Holland: Mr. Speaker, obviously we take consultation very seriously. We spoke with the first nations chiefs on the bill. This was also something we ran on and debated at doorsteps all across the country, with indigenous Canadians, and Canadians from all different backgrounds. That was a couple of years ago now. We have had an enormous amount of discussion on the bill.

I look at all the bills before the House, and this is one of the more scoped bills. It has seen a lot of change, frankly in the member's direction, since it was introduced. I do not see other bills, particularly ones that were part of the party platform, receiving this same kind of call for additional scrutiny. There have been a tremendous number of witnesses. The bill is at the clause-by-clause stage. The member has an amendment, which I would encourage members to consider and support, that reinforces the notion that this is absolutely not a registry. That is a helpful amendment that I look forward to him moving, and I look forward to Liberal members supporting it. There are ways that we continue to work forward on this, but it is time to get the job done.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Michel Picard (Montarville, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for setting the record straight and clearing up the fog of confusion and alarm created by the other side.

People from the group "Poly Remembers", whom I had the privilege of welcoming to my constituency office, consider the bill a step forward on the traceability and registration of transactions. The Ontario Federation of Anglers and Hunters, which has confirmed that this is not a registry, underscored that registering transactions provides a measure of accountability.

I wonder if my colleague could explain in greater detail the advantages of this bill in terms of respect for law-abiding citizens, as well as the benefits of improving the monitoring of transactions and the traceability of firearms.

● (2010)

[*English*]

Mr. Mark Holland: Mr. Speaker, the member raises a very important point, which is that we tried with the bill to listen to, for example, the firearms community. I gave an example on the ATT, the authorization to transport, where we made the change that said it is not required when someone is going to their gun range. Another change we made was adding the requirement for judicial access in order to be able to go after the records, because we wanted to make it clear—

The Deputy Speaker: Order. The interpretation was not working, but it is working now.

I will ask the hon. parliamentary secretary to perhaps go back 30 seconds and pick it up from there.

Mr. Mark Holland: Mr. Speaker, I was mentioning that the member made an excellent point in talking about the ways we have listened to the firearms community, the law-abiding firearms users in the debate. There were the changes to the authorization to transport, the ATT, saying that one is not required to get that ATT if they are going to their gun club. There was the change on store records, saying that we could only access them with judicial access. The reason was that we wanted to make it abundantly clear that the government can only get this information when it is going to help solve a crime. However, it is important, and it is one of the reasons the debate needs to move forward.

This is a small piece of a much bigger puzzle. We have a lot of work to do to deal with the problem of guns, gangs, suicide, and domestic violence. This bill needs to move forward so we can do the sensible and intelligent things it seeks to do to keep our community safe, but also so we can move forward to the other things we need to do to move the ball in this very important direction.

Mr. Blaine Calkins (Red Deer—Lacombe, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my hon. colleague for his comments. Nothing has done more to get me more votes in the next election than his speech. Nothing has done more to fill up my party's bank account and my EDA's bank account than the actions taken by the current Liberal government. It is the old fire, aim, ready approach of the Liberals when it comes to firearms.

This is a government that claims to make decisions based on evidence and science, so I would like to ask my hon. colleague the following questions. How many stores do not keep records? Where is the report from Public Safety Canada on that particular issue? Where is the public safety report that backs up any of the changes that are made in this legislation with any evidence or science, and why does the member and his party continue to create false narratives to get elected and then use emotional consensus to govern? It makes no sense.

Mr. Mark Holland: Mr. Speaker, perhaps the member's question shows the difference in how we think about this issue. He stands to talk about how many votes he is going to win and how much money he is going to raise. I am here to talk about how many lives we are going to save. I am here to talk about public safety. I am here to talk about how we are going to make our communities safer.

Specifically on the member's questions, if there are no stores that do not keep records, then why would he care about putting in legislation that ensures they all do? It is absolutely absurd logic. The member is saying that because he cannot name a store that does not keep records, we should not have a rule that stores keep records. Obviously, records must be kept.

By the way, if criminals know that stores do not have a requirement to keep records, where would they want to buy a gun? Would they go to a place that keeps records, or a place that does not? If people want to open a shady gun business in today's environment, they could open a store that does not keep records, and the rules today allow it.

In terms of cases, if the member opposite wants to talk directly with people who would be affected by this bill, and whose lives would be affected by this bill, let us talk any day of the week, anytime. If he wants to stop talking about votes and money, let us talk about lives.

Mr. Glen Motz (Medicine Hat—Cardston—Warner, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I find it really rich that when my hon. colleague started his speech, he used the word "distortions". He is accusing this side of the House of distorting the facts.

There is no greater distorter of facts than the Liberals. When I have the opportunity to speak in a couple of minutes, I will speak to that specifically, how the evidence and the stats have been so manipulated to try to sway public opinion that it is actually quite abhorrent.

We heard from Ms. Irons in committee. Her circumstance is horrible. What people need to understand about that circumstance is that the law at the time would have prohibited that individual from acquiring a firearm, as it does right now, today, before Bill C-71. It was human error that allowed that individual to acquire a firearm. This bill does nothing to prevent human error.

The fact that the Liberals are trying to suggest that this bill is going to solve that sort of circumstance is absolutely disgusting.

● (2015)

Mr. Blaine Calkins: It is not going to save anyone.

Mr. Glen Motz: That is exactly it.

What is the Liberal government thinking, and why does it not understand that groups like the Ontario Federation of Anglers and Hunters, which represents hundreds of thousands of people in the province of Ontario, suggest that this bill is not going to do what it suggests it is going to do?

Where is the consultation with groups like that? Why has the government not listened to them on this particular bill?

Mr. Mark Holland: Mr. Speaker, I note that I have mere seconds to respond, which gives me a difficult challenge to be able to respond fully.

I welcome the opportunity to talk to the member anytime in more detail. However, I will say that the chiefs of police, and the police more broadly, have spoken very clearly to the public safety imperativeness. During the course of my speech, I have tried to explain, very specifically, the reasons why these measures are required.

What we hear from members opposite is vague obfuscations about there not being any answers, but they do not provide any specifics in terms of what exactly their objection is to what is in the bill. That is my contention with what they are purporting to put forward.

I look forward to clause-by-clause. We begin that tomorrow, and hopefully it will be a more productive debate.

Hon. Kirsty Duncan: Mr. Speaker, I am tabling the government's response to three petitions and 11 questions on the Order Paper.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Matthew Dubé (Beloeil—Chambly, NDP): Mr. Speaker, first, as the NDP's public safety critic, I would like to say that our thoughts go out to those who were injured in the terrible bus accident on Highway 401 in Prescott, which is not far from here. We also thank the first responders who are currently on the scene. We hope the damage will be minimal.

I would like to bring some order back to the debate, so to speak. We have reviewed the various parties' positions on the bill, but we need to look at what is really before us, and that is a Conservative motion to grant the committee the power to travel. It is a motion of instruction for the Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security. I have the honour of sitting on that committee and of being the vice-chair.

Before I talk about a few of the points that have been made about the bill, some that I agree with and others that I do not, I want to talk about the process. I think that we have had a good demonstration of why the firearms debate in Canada is unhealthy. Let me explain. I am not blaming citizens or civil society, on the contrary. Rather, I am looking at the way certain political parties are acting in the House.

We had a marathon of votes, a filibuster, which essentially used up the entire first day of debate on Bill C-71. The Conservatives, the official opposition, triggered those votes. That is their right, and I am not disputing that. On the other hand, the Liberals then arrived the following Monday morning, after we spent the weekend in our ridings, and moved a time allocation motion. As the public safety critic for the second opposition party, the NDP, I did not even have an opportunity to speak before the Liberals tabled, moved, and debated a time allocation motion. It was completely mind-boggling.

These actions to stifle debate, coupled with all these procedural games in the House, have had a significant impact on the bill. This bill concerns the acts and regulations governing the use and acquisition of firearms in Canada. All this is problematic. Unfortunately, it poisons the dialogue from the outset, which does not help anyone strike a balance between ensuring public safety and considering the needs of law-abiding firearm owners.

We cannot disagree with the principle behind the Conservatives' motion to travel. As a parliamentarian, I am always open-minded, and I am always basically open to the possibility of studying a bill in greater detail. That being said, I have to say that this motion seems to be in bad faith. We have a committee that is working fine. I do not always agree with the government's positions, since I would prefer seeing more time spent on certain studies. We just finished studying Bill C-59, the massive national security reform bill. I would certainly have liked to see more meetings and more witnesses, but all in all, I would say we are one of the best-functioning parliamentary committees.

No offence to my colleague from Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles, but he is acting in bad faith. He arrived the day before clause-by-clause review with this kind of motion without trying to work with his colleagues. I can say that I received no notice that we would be talking about this, and there was no discussion of the sort. This was presented and witnesses in committee were interrupted so that we could debate motions on extending the study instead of truly using the subcommittee or some other means, such as an informal conversation, to talk about this. Still, I think that it is important to say that, in principle, I am not opposed to what the Conservative Party is proposing.

I will try to provide a more extensive analysis of the points that were raised about the study and the bill. There is something that I find mind-boggling. Last Thursday, a representative of the Assembly of First Nations came to testify. In fact, my colleague mentioned that testimony. She had some very important points to raise. The NDP has always been very clear about this. It was very important. I remember one of the last agonizing debates on firearms in Canada.

● (2020)

Speaking of respect for their hunting and fishing rights, Jack Layton said that first nations occupied an important place. Respecting these laws means recognizing the importance of indigenous peoples.

On Thursday, the Conservatives said it was not true. They said first nations were not consulted and had to be respected, but just the day before they had opposed the bill introduced by my colleague from Abitibi—Baie-James—Nunavik—Eeyou, a bill to legally implement the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. That conflicts with what they are saying in the House this evening about how Assembly of First Nations representatives said they were not consulted enough. The bill makes it clear that Canada's first nations must be respected. That is contradictory to say the least.

They have also been waging a misinformation campaign claiming that the government wants to reintroduce a gun registry, but that is not the case at all.

Let me go back to a debate that took place in 2012 about the Conservative government's bill to scrap the gun registry. Rick Hanson, who was Calgary's police chief at the time, testified in favour of the bill and against the gun registry. He said the Conservative members represented his point of view. I think it is safe to conclude that the Conservatives invited him to testify.

I will read what he said in English, which is the language he used in committee. Two key aspects of his testimony are related to elements of Bill C-71. First, he talked about firearms possession licences:

[*English*]

> If a person is selling a firearm to another, the wording must be that the transferee must present a valid possession and acquisition licence and the transferor must check with the registrar to ensure that the licence is valid.

[*Translation*]

This was proposed by a chief of police who did not support the gun registry. Conservative MPs and people appearing before the committee have tried to tell us that it is a gun registry. In fact, it is simply a reference number, a simple bureaucratic gesture indicating that the licence was checked. That is all. It is not remotely close to being a gun registry. All witnesses on both sides of the debate agreed on that.

I can say, first of all, that I will be moving an amendment in committee, during clause-by-clause consideration of the bill, to address some concerns of gun owners. Instead of having a reference number for every gun sold in a transaction between two individuals, there should be a reference number to indicate that the validity of the licence has been verified for each transaction. I asked a witness in committee this question and, instead of answering, he decided to skirt the issue and talk about other aspects that he wanted to address.

I would like to point out another aspect of Mr. Hanson's evidence. He said:

● (2025)

[*English*]

> [W]e must reinstate point of sale recording. This existed prior to the gun registry and was useful for two reasons. The first is that it allowed for proper auditing of gun stores to ensure that they are complying with the law requiring them to sell only to those with proper licences. That is a starting point should that gun be identified as being used in a criminal offence.

[*Translation*]

That statement is important. I agree with the parliamentary secretary that the vast majority of businesses that sell guns have substantial, appropriate, and robust business practices. Any respectable venture must maintain these types of records, and that is as it should be. However, having a law ensures that police officers can obtain this information, with an appropriate warrant, of course.

It is important to point this out because this was in the law before the gun registry was created, and it was an element of the law that was repealed because of the registry. When the registry was eliminated, many people in the public safety community said that this element of the law had to be reintroduced because it at least gives police a tool to validate and check where a gun was sold.

One thing my Conservative colleagues and I have in common is that we have questions. How will the government enforce standardized practices for retailers? How much will it cost? What kind of consultation will the Minister of Public Safety do in developing this part of the act? We have concerns.

We also have questions about the systems that will be used, online or in other ways, to obtain a permit to transport a restricted or prohibited firearm, especially in cases in which multiple applications are made at the same time. For example, when several gun owners are participating in the same activity, they will have to transport their guns and will therefore require a transport permit. How will this work? How much will it cost? These are legitimate questions that come up in committee.

The bottom line is that emotions run high when the topic of firearms comes up, for all kinds of reasons. Some people have been victims of horrible gun crimes, while others are legitimate, law-abiding gun owners who want public policies adopted in the interest of public safety to respect the fact that they are responsible in practising their hobbies. We recognize that this is not an easy balance and that this issue raises a lot of very difficult questions. We are hearing some very worrisome testimony, and we have a duty, as parliamentarians, to do our job properly.

As I said from the start, I am very open to my Conservative colleagues' proposal that the committee travel and hear from more witnesses, but that has to be done in good faith. I heard a Conservative member mention political fundraising, but the Liberals are guilty of that too. They sent out emails that included a bunch of quotes from firearms owners in order to raise money. Regardless of which side of the debate we are on, we are not going to be able to adopt sound public policies that respect all of the communities affected by this bill by doing political fundraising.

I would like to continue to work on this issue in a sound and appropriate way. I recognize that there are many challenges associated with it. There are measures that raise concerns, others that are good, and still others that should be fine-tuned because the devil is in the details. At the risk of repeating myself, I want to say that, if I can get one point across in this debate, I want it to be that we need to take this issue seriously and address it in a healthy way. That is what we need to do if we really want to show respect for those who have major concerns about this bill.

I asked the minister whether he was willing to review the definitions set out in the act, those that are within the purview of Parliament and that provide the framework for the RCMP's classification work. If there is one thing that everyone has agreed on since I have been the public safety critic, it is the need to update the definitions. I hope that the minister will do that. I invite him to do so. Clarifying some of those definitions will resolve many of the problems raised in these debates.

With regard to this evening's motion, unfortunately, we believe that it is a debate that will have to wait for another day.

● (2030)

Mr. Gérard Deltell (Louis-Saint-Laurent, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I always enjoy listening to the NDP member from Montreal's south shore, and I always learn something, even though I may not agree with him 100%. Like him, however, we believe that the vast majority of those who own and sell guns are honest, scrupulous people who care about their fellow citizens' needs. They are never motivated by murderous or criminal aims.

I am sure the member will agree with me that the vast majority of gun crimes in this country are committed with illegal weapons from the black market that belong to people with criminal pasts who are, in many cases, members of streets gangs.

Does my colleague think it is a shame that this bill, which is all about firearms, is silent on subjects such as organized crime, street gangs, arms trafficking, violent gun crimes, and customs officers' work? Customs officers have been left out of the whole process, even though they can play a leading role in tackling criminal weapons that could be used to perpetrate heinous crimes.

Mr. Matthew Dubé: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his question and his kind words.

I agree with him. We have to do more to address street gangs and the proliferation of illegally obtained weapons, whether they were stolen, bought on the black market, or brought across our border. I think that giving the Canada Border Services Agency more resources, resources that have been cut over the years, and tackling the radicalization that leads young people to join street gangs would be the right approach.

Let us be honest, when we talk about fighting radicalization we are not just talking about terrorism. We are talking about all sorts of ideologies that can take advantage of vulnerable people, including young people who are then recruited by street gangs.

I completely agree with my colleague that the government cannot rest on its laurels, boast about hosting the best summit that there ever was in Ottawa, or just talk about the money that was invested. There is a lot of work to be done. I agree with that.

That said, I would also agree that we must create greater certainty in the legislation. For instance, maintaining records and files could be made mandatory for retailers, most of whom are already doing it anyway. Creating this certainty would help police officers in their work and reassure them, as the Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police testified before committee last week.

As I said in my speech, there are certainly some positive aspects. We also have questions about certain details regarding the implementation of some parts of the budget. The Conservatives are quite right to criticize the government for not doing enough to tackle street gangs. However, all of these things can go hand in hand. It is not one thing or the other. There are a number of factors that affect all the very complex public safety issues, as my colleague knows full well.

● (2035)

[*English*]

Mr. Charlie Angus (Timmins—James Bay, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I have enormous respect for my colleague's work on this file. As a registered gun owner representing a rural region where many people have guns because it is part of our way of life, I have talked with many people about the bill and about their concerns. I will share some thoughts I heard.

People much prefer that it be the police who decide the classification of weapons, rather than Liberal politicians. They feel that at least it is arm's length from the Liberal government.

In terms of the issue of background checks, any gun owner I know wants to have proper background checks. That is fundamental.

On the issue of keeping records, I do not hear people back home thinking it is a registry. They believe that if someone is going to sell guns, the person should keep records. That is fairly straightforward.

The question I have is on the issue of transportation and whether it is too onerous and whether or not we can fix it at committee. I would like to ask my hon. colleague for his thoughts on this aspect, because there is a lot of uncertainty about the transportation provisions and whether people would have to jump through too many hoops and whether this is something we can fix to come up with a reasonable gun policy that responds to the needs of rural people, while ensuring that gangbangers are not driving around in the city with restricted firearms in their cars.

Mr. Matthew Dubé: Mr. Speaker, let me thank my colleague for the work he does in reaching out to his constituents. I understand the many valid concerns that they might express about a piece of legislation.

The member mentioned stores keeping records. Keeping records has been law in the U.S. for a number of decades now, as the parliamentary secretary said. The fact is that in the United States, stores are required to keep records forever, whereas this bill says it is only for 20 years. There are certain safeguards in place to make sure this information is not circulating freely in the hands of the government in the way the information in the gun registry did.

Nonetheless, it would give certainty in the law that records would be maintained and it would also allow police, should they require a warrant, to be able to access information that might help them in an investigation of an unlawfully obtained firearm.

To the point about the transportation permits, one of the key things or big issues that we heard at committee was that often a number of law-abiding firearm owners are going be requiring these permits at the same time—for example, if a gun show is being held, or something like that.

That is why in my speech I said the devil will be in the details. We have asked the minister and others before the committee what will be done to make sure that wait times are not too long and that it will be an easy system to access so that law-abiding gun owners who are going to a gun show, for example, would be able to obtain a permit in a timely manner.

One of the ideas put forward was that maybe something could be on the Internet. Well, when we see what happens with things like Phoenix, we can be wary about how computer systems work. The devil will be in the details, but it is a concern that we hear and that we hope to see addressed moving forward.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gérard Deltell: Mr. Speaker, in his speech, the member for Beloeil—Chambly mentioned the gun registry. I want to remind everyone listening that when the Conservative government was in power, it abolished the gun registry and, according to the minister at the time, the current member for Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis, the documents associated with the gun registry were destroyed. I would remind everyone that the registry was supposed to cost $2 million, but it actually cost $2 billion, and although it was supposed to be perfect, it was barely 40% accurate. This means that 60% of the data going back to 10 years ago was inaccurate. This does not bode well for the registry.

The legislation provides a mechanism for transferring that infamous gun registry to Quebec. A duly elected government scrapped that registry and tossed it out. My question is very simple. Does the member think it is normal that a government, whether he agrees with it or not, but a duly elected government, could destroy a document and it just so happens that, two years later, we discover that the document still exists?

Mr. Matthew Dubé: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his question. What happened in the last Parliament was actually the opposite. The Conservatives started to destroy the data even before the bill was passed. There was the dispute with the information commissioner about an access to information request duly filed by a Canadian citizen under the law. The commissioner went to court because the Conservatives tabled a bill after the fact to make legal the illegal things they had done. In its decision, the Supreme Court stated that they had the right to destroy the data, but that in the interests of co-operative federalism, it would be better if they gave the data to Quebec.

I would remind my colleague that his former party, the Coalition Avenir Québec, is a party in Quebec's National Assembly, which unanimously voted to establish a provincial registry. That was their decision, not ours. I think that if we really believe in co-operative federalism, like the leader of the official opposition, the least we can do is let Quebec's National Assembly decide what it wants to do with the Quebec data that was preserved by law.

● (2040)

[*English*]

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we think that we will be looking at clause-by-clause study on Bill C-71. I have an amendment that would add in a check to make sure that before any gun could go to an owner, we would look to see if they have convictions for violence or threats to an intimate partner. I wonder if I will have support from the New Democrats tomorrow in committee to strengthen the bill in this way.

Mr. Matthew Dubé: Mr. Speaker, my colleague is absolutely right. We have heard and talked a lot about gang violence, and I do not want to downplay the importance of that at all, since it is very troubling, but we also heard a lot about domestic violence and suicide and the issues that are at play there, and they are really important.

On the spirit of the amendment that the member is proposing, absolutely, I am prepared to support that type of amendment. One of the things that came forward is that anything that can be done to bring further clarity and a robust process around background checks in the name of public safety is something all parties support. Hopefully we will continue to see that support, despite the vigorous debate we can have over some of the other elements of the bill.

Mr. Glen Motz (Medicine Hat—Cardston—Warner, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the motion to provide opportunities for members of the public safety and national security committee to travel to meet with additional stakeholders on the many issues raised by experts, academics, user groups, victims groups, and more, who have been flagged to our committee.

What is worse than the fact that almost no one seems to support this bill as a solution to the issues facing Canada from gun and gang violence is that we have heard from so few people on the issue at committee.

In March of 2018, e-petition 1608 was initiated. It asks the Liberal government to scrap Bill C-71 and instead devote more resources to policing in Canada. In just two months, it has become the second-largest e-petition in Canadian history, with nearly 79,000 signatures to date in opposition to Bill C-71, because the bill is viewed as an attempt to bring back the gun registry while not tackling the source of firearms violence in Canada, which is gangs and organized crime. In fact, it is second only to the petition that objected to the Liberals breaking their promise on electoral reform.

Canadians across the country are upset at the current Liberal government for breaking another election promise. Whether the Liberals agree or not, Canadians from the north, the Atlantic, the Prairies, the pacific and central Canada all consider Bill C-71 as having the makings of a new registry that targets law-abiding gun owners and does nothing to tackle illegal firearms, gun violence, and gangs.

A government MP might want to point out that since e-petitions only came into effect in 2015, the Liberals are almost certainly going to be the ones who break the record. That is a fair comment. The selective use of statistics and facts to sell a policy or position is wrong and only causes Canadians to be distrustful of government, politicians, and the political process. It undermines democracy. That is probably why so many Canadians, almost 79,000 in the e-petition, feel that the Liberals have been arrogant and misleading in their use and presentation of facts. That makes it more important for this committee to break free from its limited view of the issue and to visit with the Canadians who will be impacted by the legislation.

It is important to ensure that information that comes before Parliament is accurate. The Minister of Public Safety appeared before the committee and made the following comment:

> While crime rates in Canada overall have been on the decline, thankfully, for decades, the rate of gun violence has been going up in recent years. Between 2013 and 2016

—indeed, we heard the same numbers presented by the parliamentary secretary just minutes ago—

> the number of criminal incidents involving firearms rose by 30%. Gun homicides in that period went up by two-thirds. Intimate partner and gender-based violence involving firearms was up by one-third. Gang-related homicides, most of which involve guns, were up by two-thirds. Break-ins for the purpose of the stealing of firearms were up by 56% between 2013 and 2016, and by a whopping 865% since the year 2008.

It sounds like there is a real crisis, an epidemic of major proportions, related to licensed firearms and their users taking to the streets and committing crimes. However, we should look at what the experts said about the current government's manipulation of information.

Solomon Friedman, from the Criminal Lawyers' Association, says that "The Criminal Lawyers' Association supports criminal law reform that is modest, fundamentally rational and supported by objective evidence. On each of these measures, Bill C-71, in our view, fails to meet that mark. First, the proposed reforms in Bill C-71 are unsupported by the evidence. In fact, in presenting its rationale for this bill, the government has misrepresented the objective statistical data to create the appearance of a problem that simply does not exist. As a society, we are the poorer for it when government promotes criminal legislation on a misunderstanding, or worse yet, a willful manipulation of what it claims is empirical evidence. On May 8, 2018, the Honourable Minister of Public Safety...told this committee that between 2013 and 2016, the number of criminal incidents involving firearms rose by 30%. Gun homicides in that period went up by two-thirds. Those numbers are alarming. They give the clear impression that gun crime and homicide by firearm specifically are a rampant and increasing problem in our society."

● (2045)

Friedman continues, "With the greatest of respect to the Minister, that is simply not the case. The year 2013, the starting point for the purported trend was not chosen at random. As we now know, 2013 was a statistical aberration in terms of violent crime and homicide in Canada. 2013 saw the lowest rate of criminal homicide in Canada in 50 years. To put that in perspective, every single year since 1966 has been worse than 2013. It's not surprising that the three years following 2013 would be worse, as well."

Moreover, Friedman observes, "The truth of the matter is homicide by firearm has, in fact, been steadily declining in Canada since the mid 1970s and when an appropriate sample size is taken, the alarming trend that the Minister purported to identify is seen for what it is—a selective manipulation of statistical data. The rate of homicide by firearm, when viewed over a 10-year period, a reasonable sample size, has remained relatively stable. In fact, it was slightly lower in 2016 than it was 10 years earlier in 2006."

Here we have a criminal defence lawyer destroying the highly questionable evidence provided by the minister. That is what shocks us. Having spent 35 years in policing, I know that such questionable evidence would never be allowed in a courtroom. A judge would severely admonish the lawyer who presented patently false evidence, and that lawyer could risk being disbarred.

Additionally, we heard from Dr. Gary Mauser about the information that the Minister of Public Safety presented as facts. Here is what the committee heard from Dr. Mauser. First, he pointed out that 121 of the 141 firearms-related homicides were directly related to gangs in cities. Therefore, the rate of violence in Canada is a a result of more gangs and gun-related shootings. The word "gangs" does not appear anywhere in the bill. Therefore, it appears that the minister's statistics of of increasing on gun violence are really just selective use of figures, and wrongly attributed to licensed, law-abiding gun owners.

In rural areas, the professor pointed out that Statistics Canada's own numbers show that while first nations make up only 5% of Canada's population, they make up 24% of the victims of homicide and 36% of those accused of homicide. This should not surprise us, as crime and violence are usually tied to poverty and a lack of opportunity.

The Minister of Public Safety said at committee:

> Right now, when a person applies for a licence, there's a mandatory look back over the immediately preceding five years to see whether they have in that period of time been engaged in any violent behaviour or been treated for a mental illness associated with violence. Bill C-71 will remove that five-year limitation so that a person's entire record will be taken into account. That will help ensure, quite simply, that people with a history of violence do not get guns.
>
> The legislation will also help ensure that people who acquire firearms are actually licensed to own them. Since 2012, all that has been required in this regard at the time of a sale is that the vendor have "no reason to believe" that the purchaser is not licensed. It's a double negative. Vendors often check anyway, but they are not, in fact, required to do so.

That statement is absolutely false. Under the current law, gun shops are required to ensure that anyone purchasing a firearm possesses a valid gun licence.

Furthermore, a legal expert told the committee that it "should bear in mind that there is no stand-alone scheme for regulating firearms in Canada outside of the criminal law. Accordingly, any violation, no matter how minor or technical engages the criminal law process. As all justice system participants know well, the criminal law is a blunt tool. It is more akin to a sledgehammer than a scalpel, and most importantly, it is an ill-suited implement of public policy. Indeed, this legislation creates new criminal offences where none were needed. For example Bill C-71 will make it an offence for a firearm owner to transfer a firearm, meaning to give, sell, or barter, to another person without first obtaining a reference number from the registrar of firearms. Let me be clear. It is already a criminal offence to transfer a firearm to an individual who is not authorized to possess it."

● (2050)

The expert stated that "Section 101 of the Criminal Code prohibits the precise conduct. It is punishable by a maximum of five years in prison. In fact, I have personally represented retailers who have been charged under the existing scheme for failing to check licence validity."

Furthermore, the legal expert continued, "The government says that the new provisions under Bill C-71 are required to ensure that firearms are not transferred without lawful authority. Not surprisingly, the existing offence under section 101 is entitled "Transfer without authority". However, under Bill C-71, one law-abiding licensed firearm owner can transfer a firearm to another law-abiding licensed firearm owner and still commit a criminal offence if the government is not duly notified. This does nothing more than create another trap for the unwary, a trap that carries with it criminal consequences. And for what? It is not for actual public safety, but for the appearance of public safety."

I had that same issue when the minister appeared before committee, suggesting that gun shops today, or anyone for that matter, can easily sell a gun to anyone who does not have a licence. Today, before Bill C-71 comes into effect, that is still a criminal offence.

The minister may be confused about what a serious crime looks like given his government's proposal to have all manner of violent criminals walk free with a slap on the wrist or a fine, criminals like those convicted of assault with a weapon, human trafficking, participating in a terrorist group, impaired driving causing bodily harm, forced marriage and marriage under 16, advocating for genocide, or participating in organized crimes, just to name a few. These are serious criminal offences, just like selling a firearm to someone without a licence is a serious criminal offence. It gets a person up to five years in jail. That is more than some child sex offenders are receiving.

It is not just the Liberal minister who tabled this legislation who has been getting his information so very, very wrong. When a professor emeritus from Simon Fraser appeared before us, the Liberal member for London North Centre, someone who has taught at a university, attacked him for not having the article peer reviewed, if one could imagine. Peer review is the process of academic review where many academics with similar backgrounds question and review one's work to ensure its accuracy.

The MP for London North Centre basically reiterated the view of a website with limited credibility. The article he attacked was in the top legal journal in the world, according to Journal Citation Reports. The article was cited in Supreme Court cases in the United States. I am not sure if the member has ever seen a courtroom, but judges are sticklers for the facts. The member's contention after these facts were pointed out to him was that he only revisited the fact it was not peer reviewed. Apparently, all law reviews are done by legal students. I guess the *Harvard Law Review* just does not meet the high standards of an untenured professor from Western.

This brings me back to the main point. The Liberals are highly misinformed, from the minister to the member for London North Centre, as they cannot even be bothered to see what our firearms safety training course looks like let alone understand it. They appear to prefer to insulate themselves and their views from anyone they disagree with and go out of their way to discredit anyone who demonstrates how wrong they really are.

Mark Twain is known for revising an old English expression, "Never let the truth get in the way of a good story." In this case, the Liberals do not want to worry about facts, just a good story to achieved their desired impact on the issue. That is why it essential that we have more input.

In our final panel of witnesses, the committee heard from Heather Bear, vice-chief of the Federation of Sovereign Indigenous Nations in Saskatchewan. To be honest, had the Conservatives not raised the fact there had been no first nation witnesses regarding the impact of the bill on them, I do not think we would have heard from any first nations at all.

Vice-Chief Bear brought a wealth of understanding from the perspective of first nations. They, like many people in rural areas, are hunters. They use firearms for legitimate cultural, spiritual, family, community, and sustenance purposes. Through Vice-Chief Bear, we heard quite clearly that first nations had not been consulted, that the duty to consult on legislation that impacts first nations was not met, that the legislation completely misses the mark, and that it would make it harder for law-abiding hunters while doing nothing to deal with their issue of gangs and gun violence.

If we need any further evidence, Hugh Nielsen, a master firearms instructor from B.C., asked for a show of hands of MPs who had taken a firearms safety course.

● (2055)

None of the Liberals could say that they had one. The Liberals, with their 30-plus rural seats, could not find one rural MP who wanted to sit in to provide some expertise and understanding of the issues around firearms safety and training.

The committee is undertaking very important work. It is important to a record number of Canadians that we get it right. It is not good enough to hear from a select group and ignore most of what we hear.

As an example, my office, along with other members, received 20 briefs from the committee clerk less than 24 hours before the deadline to submit our amendments. Since drafters need time to get their work done, basically none of those briefs were received in time for the work to be considered by committee.

We heard from no one from the north. Not a single voice from the territories was included in the debate. No chief firearms officer submitted testimony. Thousands of Canadians seeking to be heard on this issue are being ignored so the minister and the Liberals can achieve their deadline, a bad deadline on a bad bill. No one in Canada is better for it.

The facts presented by experts show, time and again, that the committee needs to hear from more people across the nation. I would like to quote a letter I received from a resident in Oakville, responding to some comments made by his member of Parliament to a witness at the public safety committee meeting last week. This constituent took it upon himself to verify the stats used and found that the member from Oakville had made a mistake. The member had suggested that 26% of homicide by gun violence were women at the hands of their partners. Looking through the stats of what she said and the source she used, this constituent found that the number was half of that, 13%. I understand that 1% is too much.

That constituent dug even deeper into the records and stats and found the following, and I will read the results, "Shooting was a factor in 33% of homicides between 2003 and 2012. Of that 33%, 13% of the victims were women who died at the hands of their partners, where a gun was used." Since the bill would target only licensed firearms owners, he checked into that as well and found that only 2.7% of those accused were licensed firearms owners.

We have a bill that the Liberals claim would protect women from domestic violence, but it would not. The vast majority of the accused are not licensed firearms owners; they are unlicensed firearms users.

Finally, the Minister of Public Safety may not realize this, but the bill would do nothing to deal with gun crimes in Florida schools. Sadly, the minister has framed the tabling of the legislation as dealing with a school shooting in another country. Nothing could be more disheartening than watching an old politician tell Canadians that because of a tragedy, he will take action, knowing full well that there is nothing in his action that begins to deal at all with these victims, that tragedy or stopping similar future incidents. This is the kind of conduct that breaks the confidence of governments and the Canadian public with specific politicians.

To maintain the confidence of our system of government, to maintain our democracy, to ensure we get public safety and the confidence of our public systems, this committee needs to ensure we have heard from all relevant parties, industry, victims rights groups, indigenous peoples, firearms users, police, other levels of government, and from silenced Liberal members.

I urge the House to support this motion and ensure that all members of the committee get public safety right. The protection of Canadians is the top priority for the House, and we cannot afford to allow the partisan antics of the Liberals to shake the confidence of Canadians in our communities, in our democratic institutions, and in our country.

● (2100)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Michel Picard (Montarville, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I want to thank my colleague for his speech. He is well aware of the respect I have for him as a person and as a professional. He knows better than anyone, and better than many of us, the impact of firearms and how much attention we should be giving them.

I would like to talk to him about a contradiction. Former Conservative minister James Moore sponsored a bill, which died on the Order Paper, that would have enhanced, or at least strengthened, the requirements for background checks and reference checks. Some Conservatives believe that is a good idea, but others are against the idea of seeing any mention of that subject in the bill.

Given the Conservative Party's ambiguous position, I would like the member to explain his personal stance and his party's stance on background checks.

[*English*]

Mr. Glen Motz: Madam Speaker, I thank my friend across the way, who I also respect personally and professionally.

I believe background checks serve a purpose. Currently, we have a five-year background check and a daily check for those who already have a valid licence. However, there is a matter of concern that I have heard from gun owners across the country. It is not the fact that we want to expand background checks, which should never alarm anyone who is a law-abiding gun owner, and it never will. The issue is that at what point would an error from 20 years ago, a lapse in judgment 20 years ago, or an individual who has returned from a war theatre, or someone who has had a mental health challenge at some point in their lifetime, prevent people from hunting or having possession of a firearm when they no longer pose a threat to themselves or or to anyone else? We have not heard from the government how that would be regulated or how the regulations would ensure we have a mechanism in place that would be fair to the individual applying for a licence and would protects public safety. Public safety needs to be the number one priority.

Quite frankly, some of the witnesses we heard at committee suggested that some of the enhanced background checks would have value. I agree. We just need more time to flush those out so we can put some parameters around what that might look like in amendments for the bill moving forward.

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Madam Speaker, I have heard from the Conservative benches that there is concern about gang crime. However, gang crime is not part of this proposed legislation, and not all bills contain everything that is related.

I know the member has background in this area. I have talked to a lot of people who prosecute gang crime. It seems to me that what is needed in that instance, and what I hear from them, is that they need more resources. In most communities, if we ask the police officers, they know who the bad actor is, but they just cannot go after them. However, a lot of information can come from things like forensic accounting and getting people to go over tax records. They got Al Capone for tax evasion, but they never actually got him for anything else.

I wonder if the member has any thoughts on whether we should boost criminal justice, prosecution, and investigations with things that are a little outside of what we normally would think about. More of this is done in the U.S. from what I understand. We could go at the tax records and go after people for those offences, and then the rest of the crimes would kind of unravel from there.

● (2105)

Mr. Glen Motz: Madam Speaker, I agree that providing police the resources to deal with gun and gang violence and drug enforcement is critical as we move forward in this day and age. However, what I find disturbing are the proposals I see in Bill C-71, which go in the opposite direction. Rather than making participation in a criminal organization a more serious criminal offence, and it is difficult to prosecute in the first place, the Liberals would make the possibility of a hybrid offence, like a dual offence, a summary conviction. Therefore, someone who is a member of a gang could receive a fine or six months maximum in jail.

Yes, there needs to be resources allotted to policing. We heard from the Liberals that Bill C-71 was a multi-pronged approach. It would go with the $327 million that was put toward guns and gangs announced last fall, and $100 million annually going forward. However, we have not seen how that will play out. We talked to the policing community. It is not so much that it needs more need bodies, which it does, but it needs the lawful mechanisms to make it palatable to go after some of these criminals.

The member talked about financial crimes. It is a booming business in Canada, because our laws make it almost impossible to try to convict individuals who are profiting from organized crime.

Mr. Blaine Calkins (Red Deer—Lacombe, CPC): Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague from Medicine Hat—Cardston—Warner for his years of service as a law enforcement officer. He is very knowledgeable about this.

I am very concerned that the legislation would do nothing to make the public more safe. That is the argument the Conservatives have had all along. If the clauses in the legislation would do something useful for public safety, they would have the support of the Conservative side of the House.

Dr. Mauser, professor emeritus, and the Criminal Defence Law Association, which is interestingly on our side of the issue in this case, pointed out that there was nothing empirical in the evidence to suggest that any of the legislation would do anything.

At several points in time during the committee meetings we had, and there were only three of them outside of the minister's appearing, my colleague had an opportunity, because the motion before us is about the committee travelling. Did my colleague have any experience in dealing with the provincial mental health acts? Does he think Bill C-71 adequately addresses issues where people or the police come into contact with people with mental health issues?

Mr. Glen Motz: Madam Speaker, during committee, I personally asked witnesses a number of times whether they would support legislation that would empower background checks and then deal with or prevent those who had been dealt with under provincial mental health act legislation from acquiring a firearm that would present a danger to themselves or to others. All the witnesses we heard from were very supportive of that sort of concept. Again, that is a step in the right direction, but it needs to have some very strict parameters around how it is applied, who would be the adjudicator of this, and who would make the decision of how far back to go and what level of threat would the individual be to himself, or herself or others. It is important this be done carefully.

What I am concerned about is that the current government has not given us the trust in it, that it will get it right in the regulations. I am not sure that will be the case. I would like to see it in legislation how this will be applied and how it will look, to ensure, as I said previously, we have the balance between public safety and to ensure no one presents a danger to himself, or herself or others.

● (2110)

Mr. Charlie Angus (Timmins—James Bay, NDP): Madam Speaker, I want to follow up on this. When I reapplied for my gun licence, the officials did a background check. They called my wife. That is important because things can change. We have seen horrific levels of violent gun deaths for middle-aged men through suicide. Who else will be able to warn that there is a problem other than family members? The background checks can do important work, especially if we talk about the horrific levels of male suicide tied to gun violence.

Does my hon. colleague not think in these instances that we can do better and we can start to identify these issues so we can start to ensure guns are not be in the hands of people who could do harm to their families or to themselves?

Mr. Glen Motz: Madam Speaker, the answer quite simply is yes. Enhanced background checks would help in these areas. It is critical that for those individuals who have presented a change, maybe from when they applied before or are applying for a new licence, as much information as possible is obtained to make an informed decision on whether the individuals present a danger to themselves or to others. Domestic violence situations are critical. As people know, the Conservative government instituted legislation that took firearms away from those who were convicted of domestic violence.

Mr. Blaine Calkins (Red Deer—Lacombe, CPC): Madam Speaker, I really appreciate the opportunity to stand in the House of Commons to represent the fine people of Red Deer—Lacombe, many of whom are law-abiding firearms owners who are entrusting me to try to make some semblance of sense out of yet another attack on the law-abiding firearms community across Canada. I will do my best.

For those watching at home, we on this side of the House have moved a motion asking the public safety committee that is studying Bill C-71 for an opportunity to travel across the country and actually hear from affected parties and those who otherwise would not have an opportunity to come to Ottawa.

Just to put things into context of how we got here, this bill, Bill C-71, much to the dismay of the parliamentary secretary who spoke earlier and said that they have had all kinds of time to do this, is number 71. This means that it is not a very high priority on the Liberal government's index. The government has had almost three years to get to this point and table this legislation, and now it wants to ram it through the House as fast as possible. After less than seven hours of debate on this piece of legislation in the House of Commons, it was kicked over to the committee on a whipped vote, where of course all the government members voted in favour of it, including all of the members from the north, and I will talk about the north a little bit.

Now we have gone over to the committee and had two weeks of meetings. We had four two-hour meetings to talk with all of the witnesses that we need to hear from. That is simply not enough. We have to consider that we heard from the minister and the bureaucrats in the first meeting. Now that we have had the chance to have all the Ottawa bubblespeak, that basically gave us three meetings, for a grand total of six hours. In those meetings we had about two people per hour, so that means we have heard from about 12 different organizations and groups from all sides on this particular issue.

However, the real issue is that there are so many people who want to have an opportunity to actually address and talk to their government—to petition them, to make their case, to make their point.

As I go through this, if the changes in Bill C-71 actually addressed serious, violent crime or gun crime in Canada, it would actually have the full support of this House. There are things that all parties in this House can agree on. One of those is enhanced background checks. We can vary in our opinions on how effective that might be, but I do not think anybody here would disagree that enhancing background checks, going further back into an individual's history to see if there is a problem, to try to protect public safety, to try to protect people from becoming victims, to even try to protect people from themselves in certain circumstances, is going to be a bad idea. We can debate on how we are going to do that or the merits of one approach versus another and that could be implemented, but there would be a consensus in this House.

I told the Minister of Public Safety during the first committee meeting that if the government would simply table or put aside all of the other clauses in Bill C-71 that have nothing to deal with public safety and focus on that element of the bill, he would have the support of the Conservative Party, or the Conservative members of Parliament. He rejected that offer. He rejected it outright at that committee meeting. As a matter of fact, he went on to erroneously try to make the case that the measures that they are going to take are going to increase public safety.

I asked the minister point-blank, because he was trying to make the case that a source of firearms that are being used in crimes in Canada are actually domestically sourced. We know that statistically that is not true, because most firearms that are used to commit crimes have come across the border and most firearms that are used to commit crimes are not long guns. They are certainly not long guns of lawful firearms owners. In fact, Gary Mauser, a professor emeritus, actually gave us some very important statistics right from Statistics Canada that said that gun crime is lower in houses where there is a PAL holder. That is a possession and acquisition licence. It is outside of those homes, such as a home in the rural part of Canada where we have maybe high crime rates. Those are thefts, so those are not firearms-related crimes, except for potentially, in some cases, theft of firearms.

However, the gun crime in those communities where there is actually a victim is far lower than in communities where there are fewer firearms owners. This tells us that criminals do not follow firearms legislation. They never have. They never will. That is why this legislation makes little to no sense.

● (2115)

I am a firearms owner. I am a hunter. I grew up on a farm. I have had a firearm in my hand ever since I was legally able to do so, whether it was for vermin control or pest control. When I was in army cadets, I would use an old Lee-Enfield that was converted to a .22 to shoot targets. I participated in biathlons. I have successfully been around firearms my whole life and I have not been shot to date. I am completely confident in all of my friends and family members who own firearms and use them responsibly. I have no issues or concerns whatsoever.

What does concern me is that manufactured hyperbole is used in a political sphere to generate dissension and to create the illusion of a problem. We heard from the Criminal Defence Advocacy Society, as my colleague from Medicine Hat—Cardston—Warner just quoted, that there is no evidentiary proof. I asked the Minister of Public Safety at committee where the report is from his department that says how many people will be saved with this legislation. I asked for the numbers of crimes that will be reduced and how many gun deaths will be reduced by this legislation. He does not have an answer for these questions because this is a politically-driven bill based on emotional arguments.

I am a law-abiding firearms owner and I do not want anyone to get hurt with a firearm. As a person who understands firearms, I am not saying I am a technical expert, but I have been around them my whole life. I know what the law-abiding firearms community thinks and does because I am one of them. If good proposals or measures were brought forward, I would help the government of the day convince the law-abiding firearms community that they were good measures, but I cannot in good conscience stand here and say that this is what Bill C-71 is.

We did not hear from a single witness from the north. In the Northwest Territories, Yukon, or Nunavut, hunting and fishing is a way of life, and more people do it than do not. All three members of Parliament from the north were elected as Liberals, and two of them are still in the Liberal caucus. None of them came to the committee to voice their questions or concerns. The member for Central Nova came asking questions. He was talking like a Conservative when he was asking his questions at committee because he has heard from his voters that this is an area of absolute concern. There was not one witness from the north, even though the motions were moved.

Here is who did not have a chance to testify: Randy Kuntz, a retired Edmonton police officer, who was summoned to the committee but did not have the time. Wes Winkel, the president of Canadian Sporting Arms and Ammunition Association, was another. Not one witness appeared before the committee to represent the sellers or retailers in this country. As a matter of fact, in all of the questions that were posed by my colleagues across the floor at committee when it comes to the mandatory provisions of dealing with record keeping, which most store owners already do for warranty purposes and so on, the only people who were asked about it were the chiefs of police.

I am going to go back to that, because we need more clarification. When I asked the Minister of Public Safety about warrants and warrantless access to firearms records, the minister actually did not know, but he said that investigating officers would need a warrant. Then he said that the chief firearms officer, who is a police officer, would not need a warrant. Then the bureaucracy stepped in and tried to help him out with his claims. It seems that during an investigation, a police officer must get a warrant in order to access the records of a private store owner as part of their investigative process. However, a chief firearms officer can go in at any time, according to the legislation, and demand to see the records, and the store owner is then obligated to produce the records.

When I asked the chiefs of police before committee if it is that cut and dried, that black and white, their answer to my question was quite shocking. They said no, that is not the case. They said it is not cut and dried, not black and white. There are circumstances in which the chief firearms officer can pass on information to an investigating officer and vice versa.

● (2120)

It is not cut and dried. It is an argument that we have been asked to believe and asked to buy that is simply not true.

Why is the government so afraid of listening to store owners who sell these firearms? Maybe it is because it does not want people lined up at its door condemning the Prime Minister's tweet, which was false and misleading when he said in that tweet that when people buy a firearm or ammunition at a store, they do not need to provide identification. That was a patently false tweet, creating a misinformation campaign out there to justify this legislation.

I have never been to a store where I have been able to even touch the firearms. When I ask to see a firearm, which is in a locked cabinet, I am asked for my possession and acquisition licence. I have to lay it on the table before the firearm can be brought to me. If I want to buy ammunition, I have to provide that possession and acquisition licence or a possession-only licence in order to purchase it.

It is a patent misnomer that right now people do not have to provide identification in order to purchase a firearm or ammunition at a store. It is patently false. It is a misinformation campaign meant to justify the ends, which is this piece of legislation, which would do nothing for public safety.

Nicolas Johnson of TheGunBlog.ca spends all of his time talking about this issue. He has thousands of followers and is well connected. Why would we not want to hear the opinion of this individual, who represents so many firearms owners?

I moved a motion at committee on May 22 to hear from the Women Shooters of PEI. The Liberal government claims to be a feminist government that does everything, that puts women first and its feminist agenda first. It would not let the Women Shooters of PEI come to committee to testify. I guess when it suits the government's need to be feminist, it is feminist, and when it does not suit its need to be feminist, it is not.

Dr. Caillin Langmann, emergency medical resident in the fellowship program with the Royal College of Physicians in Canada, in the division of emergency medicine at McMaster University, is not going to be allowed to testify. He actually works in emergency.

Stacey Hassard, the leader of the official opposition of Yukon, is another person. Did I mention that not a single person from Yukon came to committee? Even the member of Parliament for that particular area did not come before committee. I remember his absence from this place for four and a half years, and I think it had a lot to do with this particular issue.

Another is Andy McGrogan, the president of the Alberta Association of Chiefs of Police. Why did we only hear from select police chiefs that the committee chair wanted to hear from? Why could we not hear from one from the west?

Richard Munderich, of the Ajax Rod and Gun Club in Ontario did not appear, and that is really too bad. The parliamentary secretary from Ajax vetoed the ability for his own rod and gun club to appear. He just made an impassioned speech in here, which was not really based on anything scientific or evidentiary. One would think that the parliamentary secretary who represents the Ajax Rod and Gun Club would want his own rod and gun club to testify before committee, but that did not work out.

Gord Zealand, from the Yukon Fish and Game Association, another expert from Yukon, was another voice silenced from the North on this particular issue.

We wanted Harvey Andrusak of the BC Wildlife Federation to come here. We wanted to have Darrell Crabbe of the Saskatchewan Wildlife Federation come here. We wanted Bob Kierstead, who is a shooting expert and an international firearms instructor, to come here.

We wanted Kerry Coleman from the Ontario Federation of Anglers and Hunters and David Clement from the Consumers Choice Centre to come here.

We wanted the Manitoba Wildlife Federation and la Fédération des chasseurs et pêcheurs du Québec to come. I think that is the first French I have spoken in the House in 13 years. As well, we wanted to hear from the Nova Scotia Federation of Anglers and Hunters and the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities.

We did not hear from a rural crime watch group. We did not hear from anybody dealing with these issues in rural Canada at all. We did not hear from Citizens on Patrol. We did not hear from any of these groups that are affected. We heard from nobody from the Federation of Canadian Municipalities or from the Alberta Association of Rural Municipalities. The government completely ignored all of these groups.

There are other stakeholders who wanted to appear. The Firearms Outlet Canada is a gun store in Ajax that wanted to come. The Wanstalls gun store wanted to come. Al Simmons, who owns a gun store in Hamilton, wanted to come. Sports Action is a gun store in Ottawa that wanted to come. Dante Sports is a gun store in Montreal that wanted to come. Cabela's, Sail, and Bass Pro Shops wanted to come. Nobody from any of these companies or their parent organizations was even invited or allowed to testify before committee.

This legislation would directly impact them, and I think this actually violates a fundamental principle of our democracy. When legislation is being passed that directly affects Canadian citizens, they should have the right to make a pitch to the government of the day on an issue that impacts their life, but again, that is why we are here as Conservatives.

● (2125)

Conservatives are respectfully asking for this House to say that the public safety committee has not had an opportunity to do its due diligence and it ought to go across Canada. This is my 13th year in the House, and I have seen committees go across this country to talk about issues that affect a lot fewer Canadians than this one, having hearings and discussions. This particular piece of legislation affects over two million firearms owners in Canada alone, not to mention everyone else who wants to have a say on the matter.

People are upset about this. The vendors and retailers are upset because they have not had a chance to have their say. Why are they upset? It is because this bill would do several things. It would create a registry. Whether the government wants to admit it or not, it is a registry. I am a former database administrator, so I know a bit about this. Every time there is a transaction, and there are going to be transactions, whether it is a business-to-business sale, a business-to-person sale, or a person-to-person sale, every one of those sales has to be validated by the government now. People who go to gun shows on Sunday had better hope somebody is at the firearms centre ready to answer the phone. That is another group that the committee did not speak to. Nobody from any of the gun shows across Canada was invited to testify before the committee.

None of the transactions at gun shows, or person-to-person transactions, will be allowed to go through if somebody at the firearms centre is not answering the phone. As a matter of fact, the bureaucrats said they were going to have to be given notice. All of the gun show owners will have to notify the government that they are having gun shows, so the government can properly staff it on the weekends. Does this sound like a recipe for success and the government serving the Canadian people well? I do not think so. However, those who happen to be tech savvy can enter all of the information from their possession acquisition licences, and the buyer can get the possession acquisition licence from the seller.

Nobody has answered this question. If I have a possession acquisition licence and the person selling me a firearm has a restricted possession acquisition licence, nobody is checking to see if the person is selling me the right firearm. As a PAL holder, I am only allowed to purchase non-restricted firearms, but somebody with an RPAL could have in their possession a restricted or prohibited firearm that they could try to sell me. Is the system doing anything to validate that?

The government says it is not keeping track of information on the firearms, but there will be a reference number, so part of that reference number is going to have all of the information from my licence. It has a terrible picture, but it gives my name, date of birth, address, hair colour, eye colour, and my weight. I do not want to disclose that. There would also be the same information from the other party, and each transaction would have to be tracked. It is not each transaction, but each item on the transaction. If I were to buy three firearms at a gun show, I would have three registries with three different reference numbers, with my name and personal information on each one of those records. The name of the person I bought it from would be on each one of those records, or easily looked up, and of course the firearm information that is being transacted.

When I asked the Minister of Public Safety what the provision in the legislation was for when it comes to creating this transaction, he said we need to be able to trace the source of the crime back to the original firearm sale. Already there is an onus on law-abiding firearms owners. If someone's firearm is stolen, or a person sells it to someone and that firearm is stolen subsequent to that, the government wants to know all the way back to where that firearm was originally manufactured, purchased, and imported into Canada.

I do not have time today to talk about Bill C-47 and the Arms Trade Treaty, all of the other factors, the other registries, and all of the other information that the government has on Canadian law-abiding firearms owners. I did not have a chance to talk about the continuous eligibility. Every day, every firearms owner is flagged. Firearms owners are intelligent people. They know what laws make sense and what laws do not make sense.

I am hoping that I get a plethora of questions so that I can further elaborate on why Bill C-71 would do nothing for public safety. It is a registry, whether the government wants to admit it or not. Something cannot be traced against data that does not exist. When the data exists, it is in a registry. Trust me, this is what I used to do for a living. I built multi-million dollar software systems. I know what a database is, as a database administrator and a data architect. This is a registry, just with another name.

● (2130)

Ms. Iqra Khalid (Mississauga—Erin Mills, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I want to thank the member opposite for his very impassioned speech.

In 2016, there were 223 firearms-related homicides in Canada. That is 44 more than the year before. It was a 23% increase. Between 2013 and 2016, the number of female intimate violence victims, where a firearm was present during the incident, increased from 447 to 586. Last week, in my riding, there was a shooting in a very busy plaza where I normally buy my coffee. Luckily, no one was hurt.

Clearly, the Conservative government's plan to reduce gun violence did not work. We need to provide more support to law enforcement who risk their lives on a regular basis to protect ours.

Would the member opposite not agree that this legislation provides more support for law enforcement to keep us safe?

Mr. Blaine Calkins: Madam Speaker, no; as a matter of fact, we heard statistics from the handful of witnesses who did manage to make it before the committee that completely debunk the myth.

Most firearms deaths in Canada are not caused by legally owned or legally acquired firearms. That is a myth. We can take a look at the statistical anomalies of the years 2013 up until 2016, and include 2013 in that number. Not only that, I did we not have the chance to talk about the fact that domestically sourced firearms also includes firearms for which the serial numbers are burned off, sheared off, or ground off, whatever the case might be, so that firearm might have actually been sourced outside of the country. It comes in, and because of the alteration made to the firearm, there is no way to trace it, so it gets lumped in with domestic firearms.

To my colleague who asked the question, if I thought some of the provisions in Bill C-71 would make her community safer, they would also make my community safer. We would both want that, and I would vote in favour of that.

The difference between the member and I is that I understand the problem in her community is likely gang related, and it is likely illegal guns, illegally owned and acquired guns, and it is likely related to violent crime.

I will be interested to see how the member votes on Bill C-75, which is going to make life easier for all the people she claims she wants to protect her voters from.

● (2135)

Mr. Gérard Deltell (Louis-Saint-Laurent, CPC): Madam Speaker, first of all, I want to congratulate my hon. colleague from Red Deer—Lacombe for pronouncing his first words in French in the House of Commons, *l'association des pêcheurs et des chasseurs du Québec*.

Congratulations, member. I am sure the door is now wide open, and the road has plenty of opportunity for the member. I am sure he will do it again.

The hon. member, in English at that time, also expressed a real concern about hunters and those who like to fish and how we should all respect them. Unfortunately, this bill treats them as people we cannot have confidence in.

On the other hand, we see absolutely nothing in this bill to address the real problem of crime, of those who own arms to kill people, of criminals who use firearms to traffic, to commit violent crime, those involved with organized crime, and those who want to trade in firearms.

My question to the member is, what should this bill be addressing that it is not addressing?

Mr. Blaine Calkins: Madam Speaker, that is a great question.

As my colleague aptly pointed out, the bill should be focusing not on the firearm itself, but on people who should not have firearms. It should be focused on criminals, those who steal or smuggle firearms. None of that is addressed in Bill C-71. It should be focused on things that Bill C-75 should be focused on.

Bill C-75 is the government's so-called legislation to make the justice system more efficient, which means the revolving door is going to go faster, and criminals will only suffer a bit of motion sickness going through that revolving door with ever-increasing speed. That is going to be the penalty they pay for association with a gang, theft, and all of these things that are causing people real problems.

With regard to straw purchases, there is nothing in the legislation about that. A straw purchase is when somebody might use a stolen licence to try to buy bulk firearms through illegal means and ends up putting those in the hands of organized crime. Is there anything in Bill C-71 that addresses that? No, not at all.

The enhanced check is not necessarily a bad thing, but I am not sure it is addressing the right issues. On a firearms possession acquisition licence, the chief firearms officers already have the ability to go back as far as they want, if they find something of concern.

On domestic violence, the bill does nothing. With the continuous eligibility clause on domestic violence, if a spouse calls the police and triggers that continuous eligibility, the next day the police will show up asking if there is a licence, if there are firearms in the house, saying that the have a domestic complaint and are going to take the firearms. That would already happen.

There is nothing in this bill, and there should be, dealing with mental health. When police officers pick people up on a mental health call, that should be flagged immediately. It should go into the Canadian Police Information Centre information system to see if that person has a firearms licence. If they do, there should be a knock on the door to see if everything is okay.

That is how to enhance public safety.

Mr. Colin Carrie (Oshawa, CPC): Madam Speaker, I enjoyed the speech by my colleague because he knows this so well. I want him to address some of the misleading comments by the government to gain public support, and some of the contradictory statements. I am going to read him the actual government statement. It says, "The requirement for retailers to maintain their own private records is just that, they're private records of the retailers, and they will not be accessible to government." However, the public safety minister, in a CBC interview on March 20, 2018, said that these records would be held by businesses only, not law enforcement or government. He mentioned how this is a registry.

I would like the member to consider and comment on section 102 of the Firearms Act, which grants the provinces' chief firearms officers full access to all store records and inventories at any time, and making copies of the records they find without explanation or justification. Bill C-71 does not repeal section 102 of the Firearms Act; therefore, the minister was not being upfront when he said that these records will not be accessible by the government or police, or that a search warrant is required to obtain them. Could he please comment on that?

Mr. Blaine Calkins: Madam Speaker, I would be very happy to do so. As a matter of fact, the government seems to be in a bit of a conundrum on this, because we have heard varying and conflicting testimony before the committee. The chief firearms officer has the ability right now to go to any store and look at the records. We know that most stores keep those records anyway.

However, the chief firearms officer, after Bill C-71 passes, will also have immediate access to all of the person-to-person transactions that have been made with that associated reference number. Therefore, if I sell my firearm to somebody else, or he or she sells one to me, that will be captured as well. With respect to the business-to-business transactions, if one business chooses to sell those firearms to another, all those records will also come under the purview of government. The government will have control of those records. Should the business shut down and not pass on those records through the sale of the business, all of those records would automatically go to the government to be part of that transaction database as well.

This is where we need some further clarification. As a matter of fact, the responsible thing for all members of this House to do would be to know the definitive answer to this question. When we heard from the witnesses before the committee, there seemed to be a lot of confusion about this. The warrantless access of the chief firearms officer and the warranted access that an investigating officer would need is a blurry line. I did not make this up. This was told to us by the representatives of the Canadian Association of Police Chiefs. We have to be doing our due diligence and making sure that the privacy of Canadians is protected, and that their rights are not being violated through unwarranted search and seizure.

● (2140)

Hon. Peter Kent (Thornhill, CPC): Madam Speaker, I would like to ask my hon. colleague about the complaints and criticisms we heard from Canada's Assembly of First Nations and indigenous peoples about the lack of consultation and the fact that many treaties may be violated, as well as the traditional rights to subsistence hunting. Can the member explain why the Liberal government, which prides itself on consultations with the first nations, has allowed so little discussion with the first nations on this bill?

Mr. Blaine Calkins: Madam Speaker, my answer to my friend's question would be, because the Liberals probably were not going to get the answer they wanted, why bother consulting?

Heather Bear, the vice chief of the Saskatchewan assembly of first nations, testified before the committee. She spoke eloquently on a number of things, including the tragic suicide of her own daughter. She rebutted one of the Liberal member's accusations that this bill will prevent suicide, and rebuked the questioner solidly.

The reality is that when my colleague from Medicine Hat asked the question about whether or not the assembly of first nations felt adequately consulted, the answer to that question was no. We asked the vice chief if the assembly of first nations would consider a constitutional challenge; the answer to that was yes. I could see the heads explode on the other side of the table when that answer came forward.

Mrs. Cheryl Gallant (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke, CPC): Madam Speaker, as the member of Parliament for Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke, I urge the House to instruct the Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security to get out of Ottawa and listen to the concerns of ordinary, working, middle-class Canadians regarding Bill C-71, an act to bring back the firearms registry. More importantly, rather than pretend to listen to the concerns of Canadians, I urge the Liberal MPs, and their friends who sit to their left in the chamber, to listen and act if they have any desire to be more than a one-term wonder.

I believe a short history lesson for all the newly elected government MPs is in order. I owe my seat in Parliament to a very arrogant former Liberal MP, who insisted on being Ottawa's gun registry messenger to the good people of Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke. When constituents told him to scrap the registry, he chose to lecture rather than to listen. One could feel the tension in the room as he screamed at the constituents to get a life, a room packed with voters at the Pembroke Outdoor Sportsman's Club, when they asked for the courtesy of having their concerns about Bill C-68 heard. They gave Hector a new life all right, as the defeated MP for Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke. A one-term wonder he became, and has been ever since.

Prior to my election as the MP for a brand new political party, Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke was considered to be one of the safest Grit seats in Canada. It even stayed red through both the Diefenbaker and Mulroney sweeps. The former MP thought he had a position for life. The second time he ran against me, my plurality jumped from 2,500 to 18,000 voters. The farmers, hunters, and outdoor enthusiasts never forgave him, just as they will never forgive every Liberal MP who votes for Bill C-71.

Having the committee get out of Ottawa, away from Gerald Butts' PMO talking points, to hear from ordinary Canadians, is actually doing a favour to those MPs who can also expect to be one-term wonders. If Liberal MPs are afraid to defend Bill C-71 before it is passed into legislation, how do they expect to defend it during the next federal election?

Consultation must be real consultation, not the fake consultation put on by the member for Kanata—Carleton, who showed up in my riding yesterday to lecture a handful of people about how Big Brother knows best. This is what a voter had to say about that bogus meeting set up by the soon-to-be one-term wonder for Kanata—Carleton: "Number one of 101 ways on how to lose the riding of Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke is to hold a bogus gun reform meeting in an area full of hunters, recreational shooters, and sports shooters, by telling them it's okay when it's not."

The sad thing about the fake consultation set up by the temporary member for Kanata—Carleton is that she is afraid to hold a real consultation in her own riding. The smart voters in my riding, Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke, know that I am not afraid to hold a real consultation with the people of my riding. I have always been Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke's representative to Ottawa, not the other way around. I am pleased to confirm that, unlike the pretend consultation held in Petawawa by the temporary MP for Kanata—Carleton, the information session I hosted with trusted independent experts from the firearms community, Steve Torino, Tony Bernardo, and Chris di Armani, packed the Cobden Agricultural Hall with hundreds of participants.

The people of Canada want their democratic right to be heard respected. They deserve to be heard by the parliamentary committee studying Bill C-71. Silencing the voices of Canadians will not make them go away. It will only make them louder.

• (2145)

I hear the voices of Canadians who want the Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security to hear them. If the member for Hastings—Lennox and Addington is listening to this debate, this is what his constituents are saying about Bill C-71.

Mike from Deseronto writes, "In this area you were warned about siding with the lunatic you're serving, destroying this country now with this blatant attack on legal gun owners. Legal guns are not the problem. You, in this area, fully know this. If not, you best move out of the area, as we do not need this form of Liberal lunacy spreading to our children."

Michel from Marmora writes, "This proposed legislation will do nothing to stop criminals. Criminals do not follow any rules. It's the law-abiding citizens that suffer the consequences."

Mike from Napanee writes, "I keep trying to understand the Liberal fixation with destroying the sport of law-abiding hunters and sport shooters while ignoring the real bad guys. I believe I have it finally figured out. Politicians are so afraid of not being politically correct that they won't target gangs. Instead, they go after law-abiding firearm owners. We have already proven time and again that we will obey the law. Adding to it does one thing and one thing only. It makes it appear that the government is doing something about crime. Please stop using us as scapegoats and go after the real criminals."

Bruce from Madoc writes, "Listen to Canadians for a change."

Richard from Flinton writes, "Once again, our government is set on fixing a problem that is not a problem. Why don't you get tough on criminals and leave law-abiding people alone? I'm so sick of hearing on the news 'known to police'. You guys are like a dog with a bone."

This is a message from Larry, from the riding of Peterborough—Kawartha. He asked me to send it to his temporary government MP: "I am very discouraged with Bill C-71. I have been a hunter and a recreational sport shooter for 39 years. During that time, I have met thousands of fellow enthusiasts from all over Canada, who respect and enjoy the shooting heritage and privileges we have in our country. The current firearm laws are sufficient and fulfill their intended purpose for the majority of law-abiding citizens. Leave them alone. More restricting legislation will only expose me and my colleagues to more unnecessary red tape, while the criminal element continues to flourish, unabated, especially in the large cities. I realize that this impending legislation is only a political power manoeuver to placate the Liberal anti-gun voters. It will not begin to address the real issues. Thank you for letting me share my opinion and thoughts. Please do not limit debate regarding this regressive legislation bill."

This is the message Brian is sending to the temporary MP for the Bay of Quinte: "So much for a promise of a transparent government. Another election promise broken. Can't wait for 2019."

Blaine has a special message for the temporary MP for Northumberland—Peterborough South: "I don't think you realize what you have done to unite the two million-plus firearms owners. This will reflect voter turnout in 2019 for sure. In the previous election you were able to get all the legalize marijuana votes, but once legal, they will simply be uninterested in any further support of your government. At that point, the firearms community will become the voters who will turn the tides. The firearms community is an all-party community...equally tired of the constant attack on completely safe law-abiding enthusiasts. This Bill C-71 does zero to go after guns and gangs. What it is is a slap in the face to intelligent, law-abiding citizens by a smug group of individuals who believe they are duping all Canadians, including non-firearms enthusiasts, into believing that they are safer. Shame on you."

• (2150)

Add to this the fact that people behind gun control in Canada have repeatedly misrepresented the facts regarding gun control, and one can see why people who live in rural, small-town Canada reject the big-city approach of the Liberal Party.

When the Liberal Party introduced its gun-control bill, Bill C-68, it made a variety of exaggerated claims as to why it was doing so. The most exaggerated claim was the cost to taxpayers for the gun registry: $85 million. The Liberal gun registry cost the taxpayers of Canada over $1 billion, and that amount did not include the cost of lost jobs to outfitters, tourist lodges, and other small businesses that were shoved out of business by Bill C-68, the government gun law. The second-most widely exaggerated claim was that the Liberals' bill would reduce crime.

Values drive and guide actions and beliefs. They influence perceptions of the world and allow us to make distinctions between good and evil. Values are culturally transmitted, often by parents, and increasingly by the media. Values play an important though often denied role in gun-control debates. Someone with anti-gun values is likely to support anything called gun control. Someone with pro-gun values is likely to resist anything called gun control.

Firearms owners are reluctant and bewildered participants in a debate they did not start. They were willing to follow the reasonable laws but felt betrayed when the actions did not end the debate. After the last federal election, reasonable Canadians thought the debate was over.

Support of and opposition to gun control, smoke screens and partial analogies aside, depend to a great extent on views on the place of firearms in Canadian society. Some citizens have little or no tolerance for guns. Arguments about recreational use or wildlife management are meaningless to them. Those who lawfully own firearms find the views of the first group incomprehensible. At the level of values, the basic question is whether Canadians have the right to own firearms. Canadian gun owners are not campaigning for the right to keep and bear arms—

● (2155)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): There is a point of order. The hon. member for Timmins—James Bay

Mr. Charlie Angus: Madam Speaker, I just want to know if I heard correctly. It is very important. The member said that gun owners would be bewildered when they listen to her. I am too. Was that what the member said, or did I misinterpret her intent?

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I believe that is a point of debate. I would ask the member to stand up for questions and comments when it is time for that. Right now, we still have seven and a half minutes.

The hon. member for Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke.

Mrs. Cheryl Gallant: There is a smug arrogance behind the refusal to allow debate on this bill and shutting down committee, and that is not allowing Canadians to be heard. These Canadians want to be heard, and they are relaying through me what they want to tell the government and other people opposing the gun laws.

Those of us who support the right to own a gun see the further restrictions as an attack on the right to own private property. Both positions reflect fundamentally opposed but unspoken value assumptions. Both sides feel that the other is arguing in bad faith from a flawed outlook. Gun owners favour hunting, while many non-gun owners oppose it.

Among those who agree strongly with the right to hold private property, including a firearm, a big majority favour hunting, while those who strongly disagree oppose hunting too. Attitudes on these two basic values drive the gun control debate but are rarely mentioned.

One of the rules of discourse in our rational society is that proposals have to be justified on utilitarian grounds. If people were to say they are for gun control because they do not like guns and no one should have them, or that they are against gun control because they like guns and want to keep theirs, no further discussion would be fruitful.

Proponents of additional gun controls have frequently been heard to say that they do not want to confiscate hunting guns or stop legitimate gun use. Is this really true? An indication that they are concealing their basic values comes when it is suggested that the controls would be costly and ineffective. Proponents of new controls have talked about the benefits of gun control 20 years from now without always specifying that this is a society in which no one but government agents will have guns. The gun subculture, wherein parents teach their children how to shoot and hunt, is apparently to be extinguished.

Many Canadians are second- or third-generation urbanites who think hunting is barbaric. Their conception of hunting and hunters is something quite fantastic. One thinks of the lower-income family man purchasing a permit, hunting under strict regulations designed for wildlife management in the hope of feeding his family better in the winter.

From the "no right to hunt" point of view, the goal of gun control is to reduce the number of firearms in the country, to reduce firearms use, and to reduce hunting. If both can be eliminated, that would be even better. From this perspective, gun control has already been extremely effective in reducing participation in shooting for sport and hunting. Membership in hunting and shooting clubs has declined. Turnouts for competitions involving pistol shooting, rifle competitions, shotgun competitions, and trap and skeet, and the number of firearm retailers and the number of issued hunting licences, have all declined. The overall trend is clear.

The decline in hunting licences has direct and indirect consequences and costs for wildlife management. Much wildlife management is paid for by hunting licences. If hunters cannot be counted on to control excess populations, many more animals will starve, and crop damage will increase.

There are also economic costs associated with the decline in other shooting sports. It appears that it is easy to discourage the law-abiding Canadian from participating in a sport by simply increasing the regulations every year. For those with "no right to hunt" values, these arguments are irrelevant, and a decline in hunting is a victory.

The RCMP reported a stunning drop in the issuance of firearms acquisition certificates, or FACs, another success from the "no right to hunt" value point of view. If we take the rate of FAC's issued from 1984 to 1990, about 600 per 100,0000 as the normal rate, there will probably be a rebound from the low 1994 rate of 169 per 100,000. With these new regulations, many will be discouraged from applying for acquisition rights with the new firearms possession permits. Additionally, a number of firms have been forced out of business.

● (2200)

Bill C-71 is a continuation of promoting the values of those who are in the "no right to hunt" camp. With Bill C-71's words and bewildering complexities, few gun owners or police officers will be certain whether an act is criminal. It would allow the RCMP to ban any firearm it wishes, regardless of whether it is commonly used in hunting or target shooting. It would add more layers of regulations for shooting clubs. It would discourage people from the use of recreational firearms through increasing costs and red tape.

Values are important in the gun control debate. Those who have anti-firearms values can be expected to support any measures that restrict firearms use. Those who have pro-firearms values can be expected to oppose these measures. Logic and reason are of little use when it comes to values. Emotion and a sense of right and wrong are the foundations of value disputes. Just as partisans in some debates are seldom converted by the opposition, those who have pro- or anti-firearms values are probably not open to argument.

The greater the cost or reduction in public services, the less the support. Gun owners are law-abiding citizens. Since 1978, all legal owners have been checked out by the police before being granted an FAC. However, some are a higher risk than others. If the low-risk people register in great numbers and the higher-risk people do not register, as is certainly likely, the registration records will be relatively useless, an experience Canada has had twice before with firearms legislation. The first was in the 1920s to register firearms purchased by aliens. The second was an attempted universal registration during the Second World War.

The argument has been made that before domestic conflict arises, the participants are law-abiding and will register their guns.

Public opinion may support building a new highway, but the opposition from people who will forfeit their homes to it will be tenacious, long lasting, and divisive. The strongest proponents of registrations are those who think Canadians should not have a right to own firearms. They rarely have a personal stake in the law. It is not their property that will be prohibited, and it will not produce any direct benefit to them, in most cases. They will probably not be completely satisfied so long as any Canadian is still allowed to use a gun.

The values driving the gun registry debate are deeply felt but are often not discussed.

Mr. Charlie Angus (Timmins—James Bay, NDP): Madam Speaker, people back home who were not watching anything relevant tonight and tuned in to this show may be concerned that they are part of some kind of really strange reality TV script, where we have someone who sneaks into the House of Commons to warn us that the government is coming with black helicopters, with these anti-gun values, to come and take away one's right to hunt.

I listened with fascination to my colleague, and I did agree with her on one fundamental point. It is an important point. She said that logic and reason are of little use in this discussion. She certainly proved that tonight. I would like to thank her for being so subversive in how she did it. With the most ridiculous, bizarre, and paranoid whack-job analysis she did prove that logic and reason are of little use in this debate. I would like to at least thank her for that.

● (2205)

Mrs. Cheryl Gallant: Madam Speaker, I listened with interest to the question. The member said that he was listening with fascist imagination. I just would—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): The hon. member for Timmins—James Bay has a point of order.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Madam Speaker, did she say "fascist"? Was that the word she used? Did I hear that? If she said that, then she misinterpreted. I certainly would not want her to say the word "fascist". Maybe she said something else, but that is what I heard.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I believe this is more a point of debate. I know that it is getting late, and I just want to remind members that when they are using language in the House, they should be respectful. Everyone should be respectful of what is being said here. Everybody here is elected democratically.

The hon. member for Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke

Mrs. Cheryl Gallant: Madam Speaker, the member opposite speaks directly to the fact that logic does not matter. It is his emotions that are taking over. He will make great speeches about how there is a right to hunt and to use firearms, but at the end of the day, when it comes to vote and to vote against firearms legislation that is simply restricting law-abiding citizens' rights, he always turns his back on his constituents and votes for more regulations, more government, and eventual confiscation.

Mr. Chris Bittle (St. Catharines, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I listened to the speech with great interest, and I appreciated the history lesson offered by the hon. member. She took us through a history of gun control in Canada. It seemed that every aspect of it was negative and that there is no benefit at all to gun control. That is an interesting position taken by the Conservative Party.

I wonder what the hon. member would do and how she would reform gun control in this country. It sounds like she would want to get rid of the whole thing. I am wondering if she could comment on that and provide us with an answer on where it should go.

Mrs. Cheryl Gallant: Madam Speaker, as a matter of fact, I have been to two well-attended firearms legislation meetings with firearms clubs in the member opposite's riding. In terms of firearms legislation, they would like to see having mandatory minimum sentences and harsher sentences for people who use firearms in the commission of crimes instead of what we are seeing in Bill C-75, where all these harsher sentences for people who use firearms in committing crimes are being let go.

Mr. Scott Reid (Lanark—Frontenac—Kingston, CPC): Madam Speaker, I have been here for 17 and a half years. I was elected along with my colleague from Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke in 2000, and we were the only two non-Liberals at the time. I think there is an element of my colleague's comments that ought to be listened to very carefully by members on the opposite side of the House, and also by our friend from the New Democrats, as they have what they think of as fun at her expense.

I remember Hec Clouthier, who represented that Liberal-held riding at the end of a 70-year streak of unbroken Liberal victories. He thought he could laugh at the people who were gun owners, who are too stupid to understand that there is a good for society in getting rid of guns, that the guns themselves are evil, not the people who use guns irresponsibly, illegally, who think of that with contempt.

There is a reasonable argument to be made in favour of the position being advocated by the government. I do not support it, but making that position, or any position in this place, with respect is fundamental to our own long-term survival in this place. I would encourage all those members, including the one who represents the riding to my west, which I used to represent, Hastings—Lennox and Addington, and the one to my east, Kanata—Carleton, that in those areas, people respect politicians who are respectful and not those who are not respectful.

I congratulate my colleague on her speech. I have no questions. I just wanted to say that respect will get us a long way.

Mrs. Cheryl Gallant: Madam Speaker, I thank my hon. colleague. I recall quite distinctly in 2000 when we were elected under the banner of the Canadian Alliance. Back then, it was with this very issue we were able to make the beachhead in Ontario because of this very simple, fundamental issue of the right to own and use private property.

Like today, we have a number of one-term wonders who will be in this Parliament as temporary members of Parliament. So too did we have some before them, and the sweep will come back when people realize that they are not laughing at me. The Liberals and the NDP are laughing at the law-abiding citizens who have the right to own and use firearms.

● (2210)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pierre Paul-Hus (Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles, CPC): Madam Speaker, I join my colleagues in supporting the member's speech.

Our Liberal friends who laughed at my colleague the entire time she was giving her speech should never forget that the indigenous peoples of our country, with whom the Liberals are always trying to stay on good terms, use guns to earn their livelihood. Guns are part of their everyday lives. Hunters—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Pierre Paul-Hus: Madam Speaker, the members opposite should listen instead of being so insulting.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Order. I would like to remind members that they all have an opportunity to rise to ask questions. They may prefer not to do so, but I do not think we should have people speaking across the aisle.

The member for Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles has the floor to finish his question.

Mr. Pierre Paul-Hus: Madam Speaker, indigenous peoples live and hunt with guns. White hunters, or hunters of any other colour, lead similar lives in our communities and wildlife management is important. Even Quebec has a problem because there are fewer hunters, and animal populations that were usually controlled by hunters are growing. Today, we are asking for further study of this bill.

Does my colleague have information about problems with wildlife?

[*English*]

Mrs. Cheryl Gallant: Madam Speaker, when deer go unchecked in rural areas, they become sick. The deer also eat farmers' crops and, most tragically, when they are not held in check, there are car accidents. They are on the roads at dusk when it is hardest to see and they cause loss of life.

It is one thing to claim to be tolerant and to represent indigenous people, but it is quite another when we consider their true way of life and that they need firearms to subsist, including to make sure they have enough to eat through the winter.

[*Translation*]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Before recognizing the next speaker, I wish to remind the House that I realize that we are sitting late and that we certainly have different points of views and opinions. However, we must respect the opinions of others. If members have questions or comments, they should rise at the appropriate time.

[*English*]

Resuming debate, the hon. member for Oshawa.

Mr. Colin Carrie (Oshawa, CPC): Madam Speaker, I really do appreciate your wise comments. I will be splitting my time with the member for Thornhill this evening.

Let me start by saying why we are here tonight. Again, the Liberals are refusing to consult, refusing to allow reasonable amount of input and debate on another piece of controversial but very important legislation, Bill C-71. What has been exposed by the very limited conversation so far is that Bill C-71 effectively breaks another Liberal promise, the promise not to bring back the wasteful, ineffective long-gun registry. I want to thank my constituents in Oshawa for their input and insight into this bill.

To start, Conservatives support public safety, safe and effective legislation, and we also respect the fact that firearms owners in Canada are, by and large, law-abiding citizens. We believe that no government should take punitive action against those who uphold the law.

I was proud to be part of a Conservative government that eliminated the wasteful and ineffective long-gun registry. It was a good example of how poorly thought out, wasteful policy is ineffective at reducing crime rates by targeting law-abiding gun owners, instead of criminals who, by the way, do not register their firearms. That is why I cannot, in good conscience, support Bill C-71, which does nothing to address the issue of criminal unauthorized possession of firearms and gang violence, places new burdens on business and law-abiding firearms owners, and opens the door for a new registry.

As I said, Bill C-71 does nothing to address the issue of criminal, unauthorized possession of firearms. Let me emphasize this point. The Liberals seem to have difficulty understanding that criminals are not law-abiding firearms owners. Therefore, the provisions included in Bill C-71 will not affect criminals, who do not follow laws to begin with. Thus, it is highly unlikely that they will follow provisions included in Bill C-71.

In an expert submission to the Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security regarding Bill C-71, Dr. Gary Mauser, a Canadian criminologist and professor emeritus in the Beedie School of Business at Simon Fraser University, stated that Bill C-71 is a red herring and would be regarded as a failure to fulfill the Liberal government's promises to develop criminal legislation using evidence-based decision-making. Tonight we have not heard very much of that evidence, have we?

I support Dr. Mauser's view. I feel that the Liberal government is trying to create a problem where one does not exist. For example, the Liberals are intentionally using a low outlier year of 2013 to justify saying that homicide rates are increasing. Realistically, firearms homicides have gone up since 2013. However, our overall firearm homicide rate has been steadily falling since the 1950s. This is a point that the Liberals are intentionally misleading Canadians with. Total homicides, have declined at least since the 1990s, and if anything, knife stabbings in Canada have increased more dramatically. The Liberal government's statistics also leave out the fact that these homicides are primarily driven by gang murders. The majority of Canada's gun violence stems from illegal gang and similar criminal activity. However, this bill mostly focuses on gun licence holders, and not violent criminals or gangs. If we think that the homicides are driven by gangs and criminals, we should be focusing legislation against them.

Gang-related activity and repeat offenders make up the bulk of the 223 homicides in 2016. Some 141 of the 223 homicides were related to gang activity. That is well over half. Let me reiterate that criminals do not register their firearms. It seems this is becoming a theme.

I just want to briefly raise the issues with another Liberal bill, Bill C-75 which also fails to deliver tough on crime approaches. Bill C-75 aims to do away with preliminary inquiries and seeks to lower the maximum sentencing for terror and gang-related offences. In other words it is getting softer on crime. How can the government justify weakening penalties for Canada's gang and criminals while at the same time targeting law-abiding Canadians? This just does not make sense.

Let me address another thing that the Liberals are being misleading about, which is the process of applying for and receiving firearms licences. It is very important, and Canadians need to understand, that we are not the United States. In order to qualify for a licence, one must complete safety training and learn the rules that govern the privileges these licences afford one. Not everyone is eligible for a firearms licence. One must be a responsible Canadian citizen who does not have a criminal record and be mentally stable.

● (2215)

The first step in the process is to take a firearms safety course. The courses are dictated by the licences someone is intending to apply for. There are two different licences that could be applied for, a PAL and an RPAL, respectively. The first licence is a basic firearms licence, which allows one to buy and possess the types of firearms primarily used for hunting purposes, for example, rifles and shotguns. The second licence is a restricted possession and acquisition licence, which allows one to buy and possess firearms that are permitted by law for sporting and hunting purposes in Canada.

Each course has a written and practical exam that one must score 80% or better on to pass. Each course focuses on the safe handling of firearms and the responsibilities of ownership. These courses are the same across the country.

Then, step two, once someone has passed the courses, they can submit their license application to the RCMP for review and processing. This process and background check can take six to eight weeks.

I repeat, this is a process that criminals will not follow. Bill C-71 only penalizes law-abiding gun owners and small businesses. Criminals continue to operate in the shadows and will continue to ignore any federal legislation. Law-abiding gun owners and small business owners are then left feeling the burn of Bill C-71.

Small businesses will be burdened with unnecessary red tape, as this reintroduces a wasteful and ineffective firearms registry. The unnecessary red tape will be of no benefit to public safety, and will only make transportation of firearms to a gunsmith or a gun store more onerous.

The bill is forcing businesses to keep 20 years of records. In fact, I visited a local firearms retailer in Oshawa, CDNGunworx, to discuss the impact this bill will have on small business. I learned that Bill C-71 is increasing the costs of doing business for many small businesses like this one.

These unknowns make Bill C-71 all the more concerning, as the additional costs, money, and resources could be the final nail in the coffin that will put hard-working business owners in jeopardy of failing to keep their business afloat, all without increasing public safety.

Again, I want to point out that Bill C-71 gives the RCMP overreaching authority. It will increase the power of the RCMP to reclassify firearms at a moment's notice, which would make otherwise law-abiding gun owners criminals overnight. For example, Bill C-71 reclassifies an estimated 10,000 to 15,000 non-restricted rifles as prohibited, and turns their owners into immediate criminals unless they comply with new ownership requirements.

Carlos, a young constituent of mine, voiced his concerns to me in regards to providing the RCMP with the power to classify firearms. With this bill, firearms he currently collects can be banned by the RCMP at any moment, forcing him to either turn them in or become a criminal, and he will not be compensated for his lawfully owned property.

Our previous Conservative government allowed for our elected representatives to overrule any of these RCMP mistakes, and allow individuals to keep their legally owned property by exercising a democratic mechanism. No such mechanism will exist under Bill C-71. There will be no mechanism to correct the mistakes made by the RCMP.

Recently in fact, the RCMP was bold enough to launch, on its website, a page that formally read: "How would Bill C-71 affect individuals?"

To be clear, Bill C-71 is not law. The RCMP quickly changed the wording on the web page, but the damage had been done. The RCMP obviously felt that it could pre-emptively tell Canadian citizens to comply with a law that had not yet achieved royal assent. This had only been corrected after my colleague, the member for Medicine Hat—Cardston—Warner, pointed it out. This is a glaring issue that Canadians need to know about.

Bill C-71 opens the door for a new registry. We have heard Liberals say tonight that it will not, but it very clearly will. They say it will not be a registry, but it mentions the word "registrar" 15 times, the word "registration" 17 times, the term "reference number" 12 times, and the word "record" 26 times. If this is not a registry, I do not know what else is.

Record keeping conditions are placed on businesses, including information collected for 20 years. Records would be accessible by police officers on reasonable grounds and with judicial authorization. However, the government would essentially have businesses build and maintain the registry on its behalf. Businesses would have to pay the higher costs for it.

In conclusion, I hope I have made it abundantly clear that Bill C-71 will not impact criminals or stop illegal firearms practices, as the Liberal government claims. It in fact targets law-abiding firearms owners and harms small businesses. It opens the door to a gun registry 2.0, and gives overreaching powers to the RCMP. I stand with law-abiding Canadians, not the criminals.

● (2220)

Mr. Tom Kmiec (Calgary Shepard, CPC): Madam Speaker, I have been listening to my colleague's intervention, and I would like to hear more of his thoughts on this. What would be the harm of sending a committee of the House out into our communities to ask Canadians what they think of this legislation? It would be an opportunity to hear directly from communities that would be impacted, communities that are very remote and where subsistence hunting might be simply a way of life and therefore access to firearms would be a necessity. Anything that would complicate it would affect them negatively. It would also be an opportunity to hear from communities in the larger urban centres. There may be a lot of sharp shooters for whom going out on a weekend to practice an art with their kids or family members at a shooting range would be made more complicated by certain provisions found in Bill C-71. I would like to hear more from the member on that.

● (2225)

Mr. Colin Carrie: Madam Speaker, I would like to speak a lot to that because there is no harm in listening to Canadians. This is another example of the Liberal government arrogantly feeling that it knows what is best for Canadians.

We have heard from colleagues who sit on the committee about certain aboriginal groups, different police chiefs, and sports shooters as he mentioned. One of the things Canadians do not realize is that 25% of the berths we had in the Olympics were for sports shooters, Canadians who have taken up the sport, enjoy it, and are the best in the world. Part of the challenge with the legislation is there is an authorization to transport. The Liberals are changing that so for people who would like to take their firearms across the borders, for example Canadian sports shooters, it would make it more onerous for these things to happen.

Some legitimate things have been heard at committee to which the Canadian government should listen. It is unfortunate that the current government has taken the approach, and we have seen it over and over again, of using closure. It is trying to stop Canadians from having their voice.

I appreciate the fact that our colleagues across the House are being allowed to debate this important legislation, because it will make a difference to a lot of Canadians.

Mr. Blaine Calkins (Red Deer—Lacombe, CPC): Madam Speaker, my colleague from Oshawa is exactly right. Dr. Gary Mauser, professor emeritus, was one of the few in the country who was given the privilege to speak before the committee. I am sure there are many more like him who would like to bring to bear their information. He used Statistics Canada information in his presentation. He said that in 2012 there were 1,325 violent crimes where a firearm was used to injure a victim. From 1998 to 2016, on average, there were 15,000 administrative firearms violations each year. They were the only charges actually laid. There were no victims. In the vast majority of those it was simply a paper crime.

Why do the Liberals not seem to understand they should not be making criminals out of law-abiding citizens? Instead, they should be making law-abiding citizens safe from criminals.

Mr. Colin Carrie: Madam Speaker, I really do not have a good answer for him. This is what is really unfortunate with this legislation. My colleague is correct that there were 15,000 administrative criminals. In other words, as I said, the gun owner in my community, whose name is Carlos, owns certain firearms and he is worried that an arbitrary group in the RCMP will change the classification of the firearms that he uses for his sport. He is really worried he will become a criminal overnight. The bill does not provide any mechanisms to inform law-abiding Canadians, if the RCMP arbitrarily changes something out of the blue, whether they will or will not comply?

I wish I could give my colleague a really good answer. However, I think if we talk to most Canadians, they would want us to look to public safety and make Canadians safer. What seems to be lost on the Liberals is that criminals do not register their firearms. Criminals do not follow the law. Therefore, the only people they are penalizing are Canadian sports shooters, hunters, our indigenous community, and people who are following the law.

Hon. Peter Kent (Thornhill, CPC): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of the motion that would enable the public safety committee to continue its work and to hear witnesses beyond Ottawa and across Canada.

I am pleased as well to speak to the content of Bill C-71, despite the legislative guillotine that has fallen in committee, blocking any further witnesses after barely four two-hour committee meetings, and in the shadow of the time allocation that will almost inevitably be imposed by the Liberal government. As members know, time allocation was imposed five times in barely three days last week, setting a new and unfortunate record for the Liberal government.

I am pleased I have this opportunity to debate this dishonest legislation. I use the word "dishonest" advisedly in the same way the Liberals attempted to impose their version of electoral reform and then abandoned their own legislation when they could not get their way. It is dishonest in the same way the Liberals promised to run modest budget deficits and then threw all caution and fiscal prudence out the window with runaway and ineffective spending.

Bill C-71 is dishonest in the same way as the Liberals' legislation to impose on Canadians a carbon tax, while downloading the responsibility at the same time on the provinces, imposing a carbon tax on Canadians, while refusing to share with Canadians the actual cost of such taxes.

Bill C-71 is dishonest because the Liberals claim that the legislation the government is ramming through the House, without adequate consideration, is in response to increased criminal gun use. However, the legislation is absolutely void of any provisions to actually combat, control or reduce the illegal guns used by gangs and organized crime.

Bill C-71 would target law-abiding Canadian gun owners who already follow regulations to acquire licences for gun purchases and who use them within the law.

Bill C-71 boils down to the Liberals' imposition, again with the tyranny of their majority, of the recreation of an expensive, bureaucratic, and ineffective gun registry by the back door. The claim by the Minister of Public Safety that this is not a backdoor registry is preposterous, it is farcical. The government says it is a public safety bill, but, as I mentioned earlier, it does not deal with threats to public safety as posed by gangbangers or organized crime or even the increasing wave of rural crime.

This is a regulatory bill, a regressive regulatory bill, aimed at already law-abiding citizens. The public safety minister claims that Bill C-71 only requires firearms retailers to keep records of who buys a gun and with which possession acquisition licence. However, that is not true. I would direct the minister to section 58.1 of Bill C-71 for those details, and the mention of the registrar and the references.

With regard to the new requirement under Bill C-71, that the private transfer of firearms between two legally licensed individuals confront bureaucratic hurdles through a yet not costed firearms call centre, we are told it is not a registry because, at this point, a description of the firearm in question and its serial number will not be required. However, a reference number will be generated and registered, and it would only be a short hop to amend the legislation in future to achieve a 100% registry.

I would like to speak on what the public safety minister claims Bill C-71 would do to combat gun crime and the reality of what it would not do.

There is nothing within Bill C-71 to address the 167% increase in gun violence in downtown Toronto this year. There is nothing to address the 162 shootings up to May 28, just last week, that have occurred in Toronto this year, beyond downtown and across the suburbs of Canada's metropolis. If this trend continues, and there is absolutely no reason to believe that it will not, this will be the fourth straight year in Toronto in which the number of shooting victims has increased.

● (2230)

In 2015, Toronto saw 429 shootings. In 2016, there were 581 shootings. In 2017, there were 594 shootings. This year, with 215 people shot to date, the city is on course for another very bad year. There were six shooting homicides in May alone. In fact, these recent numbers will exceed, in fact are approaching double the numbers of Toronto's infamous year of the gun in 2005, when there were 359 shooting victims and 52 died.

Just this morning, a professor of criminology at the University of Ottawa, Irvin Waller, was reported by the *Toronto Star* newspaper as saying that Canadian cities had not prioritized violence prevention. The same can be said about the Liberal government's Bill C-71, which misses the mark so unacceptably. The problem that the Liberal government cannot seem to recognize is that the problem is gun crime, not legal firearms ownership.

Statistics Canada informs us, in the oft-quoted testimony tonight of Gary Mauser, the professor emeritus at the Institute for Canadian Urban Research Studies at Simon Fraser University, that licensed gun owners, those holding possession and acquisition licences, pose virtually no threat to public safety. Professor Mauser told the committee that PAL holders had a homicide rate lower, at less than one PAL holder per 100,000 licensed gun owners, than the national homicide rate. The professor reminded the Standing Committee on Public Safety that there was agreement among criminologists that no substantial evidence existed that legislation restricting access to firearms to the general public was effective in reducing criminal violence.

We will recall that the Minister of Public Safety and a passel of acolytes hosted a so-called summit on guns and gangs, at which they claimed the problem of gun crime was domestic. They claimed the problem was no longer the illegal smuggling of weapons of all sorts from the United States. However, turning to the testimony before committee by Professor Mauser, he said that criminals were not getting their firearms from law-abiding Canadians. It was either by stealing them, as the public safety minister suggested was the case these days, or through what the professor called straw purchases. He said that at the height of the long gun registry, only 9% of firearms involved in homicides were registered. He quoted Statistics Canada again, revealing that only 135 out of 1,485 firearm homicides from 2003 to 2010 involved registered weapons. In other words, barely 3% of the total number of homicides recorded in that period were legally registered firearms.

Professor Mauser said, "All reputable research indicates that gang crime — urban or rural — is driven by smuggled firearms that flow to Canada as part of the illegal drug trade." He said, again as an academic expert in the field of gun control and firearm law in Canada, "Analyses of guns recovered from criminal activity in Toronto, Ottawa, Vancouver and the Prairie Provinces show that between two-thirds and 90% of these guns involved in violent crime had been smuggled into Canada."

I return to my original contention that Bill C-71 is dishonest Liberal legislation, as with so many other pieces of legislation that the government has either abandoned or steam-rolled, or attempted to steam-roll, through Parliament. Bill C-71 would impose a back door gun registry on law-abiding citizens, while doing absolutely nothing to address gang gun crime or organized crime.

● (2235)

Mr. Colin Carrie (Oshawa, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the member mentioned dishonest legislation. I want him to comment on the misleading comments made by the government to gain public support, and its contradictory statements.

I will read the government statement: "The requirement for retailers to maintain their own private records is just that, they're private records of the retailers, and they will not be accessible to government." However, the Minister of Public Safety, on March 20, 2018, reiterated that "These records would be held by businesses only—not law enforcement or government."

I would like the member to consider that section 102 of the Firearms Act grants the provinces' chief firearms officers full access to all store records and inventories at any time, and they may make copies of any record they find without explanation or justification.

Bill C-71 would not repeal section 102 of the Firearms Act and, therefore, the minister is not being honest when he tells Canadians that the government will not have access to these records. The minister said that a search warrant is required to obtain them, but we can see from section 102 that they do not require that.

Could the member please comment on the strategy here, where the Liberals are going out and saying things to get the support but in reality they are not making the appropriate changes?

● (2240)

Hon. Peter Kent: Mr. Speaker, there are any number of inconsistencies and contradictions in the answers and explanations offered not only by the public safety minister, but also by some of those on the backbenches of the Liberal government who are trying to make excuses for what is a regulatory bill that takes clear aim at legal, law-abiding, licenced sport shooters, farmers, and hunters. The provisions and contradictions in the bill, the arguments presented by the minister at any number of news conferences, and reflected in the early termination of witnesses before committee show that the government, in fact, has a very difficult time explaining those contradictions in Bill C-71.

Mr. Ken McDonald (Avalon, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, during his speech, the member kept talking about legal gun owners being punished because of this bill. However, in October 2013, Juliane Hibbs and her fiancé showed up at a medical clinic in my home town of Conception Bay South only to be followed there by her ex-boyfriend who was a law-abiding citizen and a law-abiding gun owner. He decided to take matters into his own hands and to shoot and kill Vince in his car in the parking lot, and then walked into the medical clinic and shot Juliane.

What do you say to her parents and Vince's parents about your being in favour of less stringent rules, especially for any gun owner?

The Speaker: I think the member for Avalon means, "What does he say". Of course, when the members says "you", he is asking the Speaker. I do not think the member for Avalon expects me to answer the question, although the member for Provencher says he would be very interested to hear that, and I appreciate it.

Instead, we will turn to the member for Thornhill.

Hon. Peter Kent: Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for a very heartfelt question. I understand the pain and suffering of the family and those close to the victims of this shooting.

Conservatives believe in common sense precautions and background checks, even of those who, in some cases, would own possession acquisition licences.

I am not familiar with the circumstances in this particular case, but I do know that the statistics cited by experts at committee, before the committee was cut short from hearing witnesses, overwhelmingly point towards unregistered firearms owners as the problem in Canada with regard to gun crime, and not those holding legally acquired and respected licences.

Mr. Tom Kmiec (Calgary Shepard, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am glad to join this debate and have an opportunity to add the points of view that my constituents have shared with me. I represent an urban riding. I do not have any type of rural area in it. It is wholly within the city of Calgary. Therefore, I represent people who enjoy shooting on weekends. They will go to a shooting range, with their kids and spouse, and enjoy a few hours of doing it as a pastime or hobby. Some of those I have met are amateurs who would like to someday compete for Team Canada in the biathlon. It is something they look forward to. Others in my riding are hunters. They live in the big city but travel out every year during the hunting season to partake in something that really is part of Canada's heritage; it is something that Canadians have been doing since colonial days before the creation and establishment of this Parliament. It is something they have been enjoying for generations, and is passed down from generation to generation. There are special spots that individual hunters have in a little corner of Alberta where they go every single year to enjoy hunting with their kids because their grandfather took them, because their great-grandfather took them. Everybody has those types of stories in Alberta. That is the point of view I want to share with the House today, as I add my voice in support of an instruction to the committee to travel across Canada so that we can hear these types of stories and include them in the record.

My hope, and the hope of many constituents who have communicated with me on this particular issue, is that the government will change its mind. The question is not between having less regulation when it comes to firearms or having way more; it is what is reasonable in this situation, and a lot of the provisions contained within Bill C-71 are unreasonable. There are a lot of hunters, firearms owners, and individuals who used to own firearms stores and provided that service to the community, selling firearms in a reasonable, respectful, logical, rational way, not just selling them willy-nilly to anybody who came off the street, but doing their due diligence in providing a service and a product that people wanted because they had a past-time that involved it. Those are the people I represent, and I hope to be able to pass on their wisdom to the House so it can vote and move in favour of this instruction to the committee to travel.

I am a big believer in having committees travel across Canada. I sit on the Standing Committee on Finance. It is a committee that travels every single year, and maybe it will be able to travel later on this year if it says yes to a certain mortgage study I would like to undertake on behalf of constituents in my riding. Travel is something that the finance committee does quite often, with the pre-budget round tables that it holds to hear from Canadians in different communities to get their perspectives and not have them all travel here to Ottawa, which is a cost to many. It is a cost in time especially because the House reimburses much of the cost of travelling here, but time is the most precious thing that they do not get back and many people simply do not have the time to travel to Ottawa to have their voices heard at committee.

There were 95 briefs provided to the public safety and national security committee on Bill C-71 and 31 witnesses. I do not think that is enough for this particular piece of legislation. The committee could easily have double, triple, quadruple that number of witnesses, who would give them really interesting data and personal perspectives, and provide evidence that is so crucial to good public-policy making. Therefore, where is the harm in sending the committee to travel and to have the time to consult with Canadians and hear from them both the evidence and their individual perspectives of what a reasonable piece of legislation on firearms regulation is?

I have heard members here accuse our side of not wanting any types of limits on gun ownership, which is patently untrue. We understand that some limits, some administrative procedural limits, are indeed reasonable. However, where is that fine line where it becomes a burden, sometimes such a burden that a person abandons even owning any type of firearm? In the cases of firearms owners who are farmers as well, that becomes an immense inconvenience to them. If hunters, because of government regulation, give up the practice of hunting they have done for generations and hope to pass on to their kids, that is unfair and unjustified. Government should not lead people to abandon hobbies they have been doing in a law-abiding way for generations. It is part of the Canadian experience to go out and participate in hunting. I will mention that a bit more as I go into further points on why I believe this committee should indeed travel, because it is worthy to hear from Canadians.

● (2245)

I have a Yiddish proverb, as I always do. A lot of members ask me which one it will be today. It goes like this: "No one hides—neither the wicked his wickedness, nor the fool his folly." I really hope that neither of those is true in this case and that the Liberals are not trying to hide here in Ottawa something that they know will be deeply unpopular in rural areas and in parts of my riding in suburban Calgary, where I have many constituents who hunt and enjoy sports shooting at the many target ranges in Calgary.

I also hope this is not folly, the folly of following activities and the news that we hear from the United States, which do not translate very well to our experience here in Canada. They are not the same thing. We cannot be influenced by what we hear happening in the United States on the six o'clock news and then instantly compare that to our experience here in Canada. We have a totally different civic culture and a different point of view on what is considered responsible firearms ownership. It is completely different.

I say this as someone who has studied in the United States. I say this as someone who has spent a lot of time with Americans on campus. I can attest to the fact that they have a totally different perspective when it comes to their inheritance of what they call the second amendment. It is something completely different from what we have in Canada.

I also hope that there is no ulterior motive behind this particular piece of legislation, such as sewing division among Canadians for purely partisan political purposes. The wicked cannot hide their wickedness, just like the Yiddish proverb says. I really hope that is not the case.

As supporter of mine sent me a fundraising email put out by the Liberal Party of Canada, which was fundraising off this particular piece of legislation. I am concerned when I see things like that. I am concerned when I see division being sewed for the sake of division.

Going outside of Ottawa will help us draft better legislation. I do not think we have all the answers here in the nation's capital. The common wisdom of Canadians will pull through in the witness testimony and briefs they provide. Why do we not send the committee out to draw out that information? It could bring it back to the House so we could create a more fulsome piece of legislation, a more fulsome report to the House of Commons, and make a judgment call that is evidence-driven and not driven by what happens inside the bubble. We have all heard stories of what happens inside the bubble. If we get this information, we will not be swayed just by debate here on the floor, but by what Canadians have to say on the subject.

As I said, I have spoken to many constituents in my riding who are hunters and sports shooters on weekends. They are all lawful firearms owners.They are not looking to break the law in any way. The simple thing is that they have likely spend thousands of dollars on a sport they would like to continue to enjoy. A few of them will attest to the fact that some of these rifles do not come cheap.

I am not by any means saying this is a sport for everyone. Sharpshooting or sport shooting on weekends requires a certain type of firearm that is simply not easily available. This sport takes a lot of skill and ability. These people are not looking to commit crimes. They do not want to lose the investment they have made. This is the perspective they have brought to me.

There are a lot of shooting ranges around Calgary where they go to practice. They are worried that some of the provisions in Bill C-71 would make it more difficult for them to travel between their homes and the range. They are worried that the bill would make it more difficult to purchase a new firearm to replace an older one. They are worried that the legislation would make it more burdensome for them to continue practising a hobby they enjoy.

This is not the case for everyone. As we heard from our colleague from Thornhill, there are people out there who will commit a crime. They will commit a crime of passion. They will commit a crime because they have fallen on hard times and have resorted to criminal activity. These people will not be stopped by more procedure, more administration, or more red tape. If they are intent on committing a crime, they will find a way to do so.

We have heard from other members, and I agree with this point, that this legislation would not stop gangsters and criminals in any way from continuing to commit crimes.

● (2250)

The wicked will continue their wickedness, and there is nothing in this piece of legislation that will stop them. Neither gang nor organized crime appears in this piece of legislation. I would have thought if the stated purpose was to clamp down on violent crime with firearms, then why is no one addressing that issue? Why are we not going after those who use firearms in their daily activities, as far as an organized crime gang? Why are we not targeting specific individuals? Things like minimum mandatory sentencing achieves that goal. It puts them away.

I want to propose a few ideas I have that the government could achieve to reduce gang activity, to take away the ability of gangsters to cycle through our justice system without ever facing a judge. The FOB gang is a good example, in Calgary. They are gangsters who have been involved in murders, attempted murders, trafficking, and their leader was set free once again a few weeks ago because of the Jordan decision.

That same day, I met the arresting officer here in Ottawa. He explained to me how they arrested this gang leader. Now he is out on the streets once again, and the police know he will commit another crime. He had a loaded firearm underneath his car seat when he was stopped and then arrested. That was why they were able to arrest him on that charge and send him back to jail.

Why are we not targeting those types of individuals? Those are the individuals we should be trying our best to keep off our streets. It is not the hunter, the farmer, or the gentleman who enjoys showing his kids how to do sport shooting on weekends. They are not the problem; it is the gangsters. Those are the people we should be targeting. The FOB gang is a good example. It is a perfect example, coming from Calgary. There are other provisions.

An hon. member: Oh, oh!

Mr. Tom Kmiec: If a member wishes to heckle me, I will be happy to cede some time to them if they want to ask me a question.

This piece of legislation creates a registrar. The only purpose for creating a registrar is to manage a registry. I used to work for a professional association, and I was named its registrar. I managed a registry of professional members. A mayor will run a city. A reeve will run a county. The president of a company will run a business. We cannot pretend for one minute that a registrar will not run a new long-gun firearms registry. In this piece of legislation is embedded a method to do so; every single sale will be tracked. It is a return through the back door to the national firearms registry that a previous government got rid of because it was so massively unpopular across Canada. It was ineffective and a boondoggle. Billions of dollars were wasted on a registry that achieved very little.

In this piece of legislation are also provisions on a background check, and that will go on for lifetime. At a time when people have become extra sensitive about their privacy, it is interesting that they will go through a whole lifetime of an individual to judge whether they should be able to have a PAL or an RPAL to own and use a firearm.

What about second chances? What about persons changing? I thought that was one of the things we were advocating for. That is a concern of mine. I have met a lot of great constituents, great individuals, who in their past had criminal activity, and they changed. They have successful professional pursuits. They have married. They have family lives. Are these the people we want to target? Do we want to tell them that there are no second chances?

I completely agree that there should not be second chances for certain types of criminal activity. It is hard to tell in the provisions in Bill C-71 what those are and where the line will be drawn. Why not go out into our communities and ask Canadians where the line should be drawn? Where should the difference be between people who perhaps have made mistakes early in their lives and have reformed, and decades later are seeking to have the privilege in Canada to own a firearm so they can go hunting with fellow family members?

● (2255)

As I have mentioned many times in the House before, there are provisions in this bill that would give the right to reclassify a firearm from unclassified, non-restricted, or restricted, to prohibited, solely to the RCMP, with no oversight from the House of Commons or the minister. I have a serious problem with that. To me, it is a deep issue of parliamentary supremacy and responsibility with respect to who is responsible at the end of the day for decisions made on the administrative side. It should be this House that keeps the Minister of Public Safety accountable for the decisions he or she makes in the conduct of duties. It should be members in the House making these decisions, and not the RCMP. The RCMP is there to advise. We can say that it has a body of evidence and it can provide a certain expertise, but it should not be solely up to the RCMP to make decisions on how certain firearms are reclassified.

There are two important ideas why it should not be allowed to do this. First is this idea of parliamentary supremacy that I talked about. We should not be giving agencies of government the power to deprive people of their private property without having Parliament make a judgment call. That would be by making a direct decision, or by demanding the Minister of Public Safety to be held accountable in the House through the different procedures we have, either through committee, question period, or through debate in the House. I do not think that should be allowed.

Second, this is private property as well, and a lawful firearms owner can have his firearm reclassified. Sometimes we are talking about just one firearm that an owner has to dispose of, but we could be talking about thousands of dollars in firearms that an owner no longer has access to.

What can be done? I have a few suggestions that have been suggested to me by constituents. Minimum sentencing laws are a proven way to keep gangsters and criminals who use guns off the streets. I do not mean for administrative penalties; I mean for violent crimes committed with firearms. As long as minimum sentencing is not excessive, it serves the purpose of taking violent criminals off the street for the minimum amount of time necessary, and it keeps our streets safe. Repeat criminals would also be deterred by this. We should punish criminals. People should be sent to jail for using a firearm in criminal activity. It cannot be that a person gets to go just to provincial court, or that a person gets a fine.

I also think we should do more to help our major urban centres, because crime does not stay there. One of the things the Calgary Police Service told me repeatedly is that rural crime is driven by what happens inside the cities. There are criminals inside the cities who go into rural communities to commit crimes. I know it has happened in the member for Foothills' riding just south of mine. There are repeated stories all across Alberta of criminals from big cities moving into our smaller communities and taking advantage of the fact that there are not enough police officers to police every single township road there. It is not physically possible. Cities need to do more to take control of the gang problems they have.

Lastly, prison time should be used for rehabilitation. It is something I fervently believe in as a result of the time I spent learning about the prison system in the United States while I studied there. I believe that prison time should be used for rehabilitation. A component of prison time is punishment and paying one's dues back to society for the crime one has committed, but rehabilitation should definitely be part of it.

These are just a few things. The problem is repeat criminals, the gangsters.

To go back to the Yiddish proverb I mentioned that no one hides, let us not hide the committee here in Ottawa. Let us not allow the wicked his wickedness, nor the fool his folly. We have an opportunity here to instruct the committee to travel across Canada and collect more information and more evidence from Canadians. I see no harm in this, and therefore I am supportive of it. I hope all members of the House will support it as well.

● (2300)

Mr. Jim Eglinski (Yellowhead, CPC): Mr. Speaker, every summer in my riding of Yellowhead, we have a shooting competition called Got Your Six. First responders and military personnel from across Canada participate. I am talking about ambulance drivers, police officers, firemen, and retired and current military personnel. They come to our community of Edson because we have one of the longest ranges in western Canada. It is a mile range. I go there every year during their competitions and meet with the guys.

Bill C-71 would directly affect these people. These are hard-working Canadians who are first responders. Why do they go to Got Your Six and what is it? It is an organization that looks after people in the military, police, fire department, and ambulance who have post-traumatic stress. They raise funds through their combat shoots. It is a way of bringing some of those comrades suffering from post-traumatic stress out to the range and to help them. It is a form of medication, yet Bill C-71 would directly affect these people.

Money could be more wisely spent on seriously combatting the criminal element out there than going after the law-abiding Canadians. I wonder if my hon. friend from Calgary Shepard would like to comment on that, especially since they have a problem in Calgary with organized gangs.

● (2305)

Mr. Tom Kmiec: Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the member for his 30-plus years of service in law enforcement. When he speaks of the community he used to be part of, he speaks from experience. He knows the subject very well.

Fundraising with a firearms-related event such as skeet shooting is really common in Alberta. I have been to political events all across Alberta, and probably a half-dozen skeet shooting events that were political fundraisers. These are simply a way for the community came together to raise money for a good cause. Sometimes it is for a political party, and other times it is community organizations looking after fellow community members. This is what they do. This is what they know. It is very popular. It is part of the shared cultural heritage of a lot of our communities, especially in rural Alberta. They have been doing it for generations and want to continue doing it. The rules embedded in Bill C-71 would make it that much more difficult to continue these types of good events.

Mr. Martin Shields (Bow River, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate very much my knowledgeable colleague's speech today, particularly when he touched on a very specific aspect. We are very proud of the Canadians who owned the podium at the Winter Olympics, and of the events in the Summer Olympics. Where do we think these people come from and get their experience to participate in these Olympic events? We are very proud to see our athletes perform in these sports and compete.

The member touched on the Olympic events. The Canmore Olympic centre west of Calgary is a site left from the 1988 Olympics and is very well used. Part of that has to do with guns, the sporting of guns, and the Olympic events. Maybe you could make a comment about that.

The Speaker: I will give a gentle reminder to the member for Bow River that it is "he" and "his" and so forth. Of course, "you" is referring to the Speaker.

The hon. member for Calgary Shepard.

Mr. Tom Kmiec: Mr. Speaker, the question is always where these people will come from, the ones who are really great at the biathlon and who have perhaps had a decade of practice before they get to that level of competing on the world stage and where we can really see who is truly the best athlete.

It is the same thing with hunting. It is not something one can just learn overnight. It is something that one will probably spend a decade or two going out and learning with someone else. I have a personal story. I remember working for Fish & Wildlife back in Alberta when we introduced the hunter host licence. It was a way for a dad to take his 12-year-old son hunting in a supervised and controlled way. As a hunter host licence holder, one had to go with someone who had a full licence in order to hunt. It was a way to learn and encourage families to pass on their traditions, to pass on this heritage they had and not to abandon hunting. It was a big problem in the big cities. It worked and started to reverse the trend of people abandoning what is and continues to be part of their Canadian heritage, which is something that should not just be abandoned because we are concerned about gun crimes. Gangsters using firearms in their illicit, illegal activities should be addressed by other means.

Ms. Rachael Harder (Lethbridge, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am wondering if my hon. colleague could comment on the juxtaposition or comparison between Bill C-71, which would punish law-abiding firearms owners, and Bill C-75, which the Liberals would also put in place, which would decrease sentences for heinous crimes, such as being a part of a terrorist group or an organized crime group, promoting genocide, forcing women into marriage, and trafficking women and girls for sex purposes.

There are these types of crimes the Liberals would actually be going extremely soft on. They would actually decrease the sentences for these types of crimes. Meanwhile, the Liberals want to put law-abiding firearms owners behind bars.

Could the hon. member comment on the comparison of the legislation the Liberals would impose on the Canadian population?

● (2310)

Mr. Tom Kmiec: Mr. Speaker, that question is a good juxtaposition of the two bills, a contrast, almost.

I am very happy that one of the member's constituents is the one who proposed what I think is going to fast become the e-petition with the most signatures. Maybe the member could tell me afterwards what the signature count is.

It is interesting to see that in Bill C-71, we would be going after law-abiding firearms owners. What will do they? They will abide by the new law. They will try their best to obey the law as it is written by the Parliament of Canada.

On Bill C-75, we would download onto the provincial courts a lot of the provisions for criminal activity, such as the promotion of genocide, such as drinking and driving causing serious bodily harm, such as infanticide, and say that the provincial courts would handle it now, and that would be better.

What happens in Alberta, oftentimes, in provincial court, because they are so overloaded with cases, is that they are always looking for an opportunity to find a plea deal they can live with. They will offer up a fine to people, saying that if they do not pay the fine, they will serve jail time. In certain cases, and there is a laundry list of these provisions in Bill C-75, it is irresponsible to offer an opportunity to simply pay a fine for the crime done. We can contrast that with Bill C-71 and the provisions imbedded within it.

These are the wrong priorities, especially at a time like this, when resources at our courthouses are limited. For the longest time, the Minister of Justice was behind on appointing judges, and the issue remains. If we approve of this, travel of the public safety and national security committee, the members are going to hear this story in our communities. They are going to hear stories of local courthouses being overloaded with work already and not being able to deal with additional court cases.

They are going to be able to tell the story that law-abiding firearms owners will abide by the law, whichever way it is written by the Parliament of Canada. However, gangsters, organized crime, and other criminals will not. That will not change. Those individuals who take part in illegal organized crime activity, such as trafficking in firearms, people, and narcotics, are not going to be swayed by a piece of legislation passed in the House. Frankly, they just do not care about those things. The deterrence will be through greater law enforcement resources, more police officers, and a more effective way of tracking down the money as it is being spent by those types of organizations.

We are not focused on that. We are focused on lawful firearms owners who are looking to just obey the law.

Mr. Larry Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to speak to this motion tonight. I will be sharing my time with the hon. member for Lethbridge, who just had a very good question in the House.

This motion is a simple motion that should play well to what the Liberals talk and brag about. I will use the fisheries committee. Every time we want to get something done there, we had better consult. The Liberals have their chance this time to actually go and consult with Canadians on a very important bill. They are fighting it tooth and nail. It does not surprise me, but it is certainly wrong.

This is a good motion and is one that is certainly needed, as many have said here tonight. It asks that the public safety and national security committee travel throughout Canada to hear testimony from witnesses as they continue to review Bill C-71. The reason this is necessary is that the government has failed, as with a lot of other consultations it says it is doing or has done, with Canadian firearms owners and other interested groups when it comes to the new firearms legislation. It really is shameful. As I said earlier, it is not surprising, but it is certainly shameful.

The government has introduced legislation that will make significant changes and will impact only law-abiding firearms owners. However, they have proposed these changes without truly engaging with these individuals to fully understand what these changes would actually do.

Since the 2015 election, the government has conducted more than 2,000 different consultations on a wide range of subject matter. However, a search through those consultations shows that they did not, or would not, consult with firearms owners about legislation that would significantly impact them. What is the reason for that? Is it that they are not going to like what they are going to find? I think they know that this bill, Bill C-71, has nothing to do with what they said they wanted to tackle, which was gang crime and illegal firearms. Why they do not want to, I do not know.

We have the hon. colleague from Scarborough, a former police chief. When he was in the public sector working as a police chief, he was adamantly against the legalization of marijuana. What he is doing today? He is the guy who is managing how it is going to come about. It is total hypocrisy. Things change when one puts on a political stripe. I cannot get my head around that and how wrong it really is.

In fact, I have been hearing from a number of concerned Canadians regarding this exact issue. They are concerned that not only did no consultation take place but that consultations were only conducted with groups that support the government's agenda when it comes to firearms. They keep asking me where this gang crime and illegal firearms issue is the government purports to want to address. Again, there is exactly nothing in here about it.

I put a question on the Order Paper on April 18 . It asked the government where, when, and with whom the government consulted when it came to Bill C-71. I am still anxiously awaiting the government's response. It is coming up to two months. I strongly suspect that the reason I have not had an answer to my Order Paper question is that the government did not consult at all on Bill C-71.

That said, this is another reason this motion is necessary. The government has been unwilling to listen to firearms owners, and we need the public safety committee to do the work the government is unwilling to do. They need to travel across Canada to ensure that any firearms legislation that is passed through this House directly targets gangs and illicit firearms and not individuals who have safely and properly used firearms for years, like me. I have had a gun in my hand since my father taught me when I was eight or nine years old. I had my granddaughter, who is now 13, on the range with a safety instructor there when she was 12.

● (2315)

It is all legal. It is the way to teach things. It does not matter whether it is manners or anything. If people are taught the right way, at the right age, they will learn it, and it will stay with them. That is what I want my granddaughter to do, and my other grandchildren as they come of age. That will happen the same way. It is what people in rural Canada do. Actually a lot of urban Canadians do the same thing. It is just a higher proportion in the rural parts, for different reasons.

Had the government conducted consultations, it would have heard that its proposed legislation only would create more red tape for those who already followed the law. It would do absolutely nothing to fight the real problems when it came to firearms violence in Canada: gangs and illegal firearms.

I sit with the hon. member for Avalon on the fisheries committee. I have a lot of respect for the gentleman. He told the previous member about a terrible incident that had happened in his riding. Unfortunately, with people, things happen from time to time, but that is not the norm and is not what happens every day with law-abiding firearms owners. As I said, it was very unfortunate

However, because something like that happens, we do not go out and basically victimize every law-abiding firearm owner in the rest of the country. We already have the toughest handgun laws and firearms legislation in the world. There is no doubt about that. It is not up for questioning. However, we have a segment of people out there, and I hope my colleagues across the way understand this and realize it, whose goal is not for stricter rules on firearms. Its goal is to at some point in time have absolutely no guns in the world. If it ever gets to that point, there will still be guns, but they will all be owned by the criminal sector of gangs, organized crime, etc. Why those guys across the way cannot get that through their heads always leave me shaking mine.

We hear time and again from a diverse range of groups, associations, and individuals that Bill C-71 is an attempt to solve problems that do not exist.

Last week, I was able to sit in at the public safety committee for my colleague to my right. It was a great meeting. We had some great witnesses on both sides of the issue. I have some testimony of that day. For example, Mr. Soloman Friedman of the Criminal Lawyers' Association told the public safety committee "Bill C-71...fails to meet that mark" when it comes to meeting the benchmarks of being modest, fundamentally rational, and supported by objective evidence. He went on to say that the apparent problems that Bill C-71 would attempt to solve were "unsupported by evidence".

I would like to quote again from his testimony before the committee. He stated, "in presenting its rationale for this bill, the government has misrepresented the objective statistical data to create the appearance of a problem that simply does not exist. As a society, we are the poorer for it when government promotes criminal legislation on a misunderstanding, or worse yet, a willful manipulation of what it claims is empirical evidence."

These are very strong words, and they are true. One thing the government did was use the year 2013. Gun crimes have been steadily dropping since the mid-60s, but in 2013 they really dropped. What did the government do, and it was pretty sneaky? It used that year as ground zero, knowing it was going to go up the next year. It started with the wrong data. It is misleading.

● (2320)

Mrs. Cathay Wagantall (Yorkton—Melville, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I very much appreciate the common-sense approach to this issue that my colleague has taken. On the one hand, as he mentioned, the government is becoming softer on criminals, and on the other hand, it is creating issues for law-abiding gun owners. He spoke about how confusing this is to us on this side of the floor. Could he comment as well on the fact that, on that side of the floor, there are at least 30 MPs from rural ridings where this is a serious issue, yet they are not standing up for their constituents?

Mr. Larry Miller: Mr. Speaker, the question from my colleague from Saskatchewan leads right into something that my colleague from Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke mentioned previously about the temporary MPs on the other side of the House. In 2011, there were a few MPs over there who, because of their past support for the long gun registry and so forth, ended up being temporary MPs. I can tell members that there are going to be a lot more of those temporary MPs over there, in those rural ridings, if they continue to go after legislation like this, pretending to target gang crimes, illegal firearms, and organized crime but instead tackling law-abiding firearm owners because they are an easy hit, instead of going after the others.

● (2325)

Mr. Colin Carrie (Oshawa, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals promised that they would draft legislation based on evidence. My colleague knows, as I know, that sport shooters are responsible people who keep their firearms in good condition. What the Liberals are doing is changing the authorizations to transport. In other words, they are eliminating transport to and from a gunsmith; transport to and from a gun store for appraisal of sale; transport to and from a gun show; transport to and from a border point.

My colleague has a lot of experience. He said he has been using firearms for a very long time. Is there any public safety issue with respect to why the Liberals eliminated these provisions? If there is a public safety issue, what would it be?

Mr. Larry Miller: Mr. Speaker, that is a great point. No, there is no public safety issue here. Bill C-42, which the previous government passed in 2015, actually streamlined some of these. It did not let people off the hook. They still had to get these transport permits. However, the government before that, and the party across the way today, actually made the rules so that people had to get an invite every time. If people could not show that they had an invite from, say, the Bruce Peninsula Sportsmen's Association in my riding to go there, and they were heading to an advertised legal shoot, all of a sudden they were criminals because of some technicality that they may or may not have even known about. That frustrated and ticked off law-abiding firearms owners.

While I am on this, I want to talk about the registry part of it and some of the testimony that we heard last week. When it comes to the registry, we know that this is the backdoor idea. At the meeting I referred to, Mr. Solomon Friedman's comment was, "If it walks like a registry, talks like a registry, and even seems to quack like a registry, it's a registry."

Mr. Jim Eglinski (Yellowhead, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I was looking at some statistical data from early 2010, just prior to our making some changes to the firearms regulations. At that time, 92% of the police officers across Canada said that the long gun registry was no good. A survey done by a police officer out of Edmonton showed that 2,410 police officers out of 2,631 said that it was a waste of time and it did not work. What is very interesting is that the RCMP, which was in charge of it, did a survey that said 81% were in favour. I wonder if the member would just comment on the numbers, because there was a lot of that in the last day or two.

The Speaker: I am afraid the hon. member for Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound will not have a chance to respond. We will have to take that as a comment rather than a question, because the time has now expired.

Resuming debate, the hon. member for Lethbridge.

Ms. Rachael Harder (Lethbridge, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I strongly support the motion that is on the floor, which is to have the Standing Committee on Public Safety travel as part of its consideration of Bill C-71. This legislation is deeply flawed, and therefore it would serve the committee very well to travel across the country to talk to everyday Canadians. The government claims that this legislation is in the interest of public safety, but the reality is quite different. I would like to outline that for the House.

This legislation would create a bunch of useless red tape that will not make Canadians safer. In fact, this bill shows classic Liberal logic. The current government is saying that it wants to keep Canadians safe and prevent gun violence, but this legislation would do absolutely nothing to accomplish this end. Instead, it would target or go after firearms owners who have already gone through extensive background checks and safety courses in order to possess their guns and use them lawfully.

In addition, it would create the failed long-gun registry that cost Canadians $1 billion, and then was scrapped because it was so wasteful and ineffective. Bill C-71 would force retailers to keep transaction records for 20 years on every single person who buys a gun. This would increase the cost that would then be passed on to the consumer, not to mention that it would also make a great shopping list for criminals, should they get a hold of that list and then acquire those firearms based on where they are.

Furthermore, this legislation would remove the ability of licensed firearms owners to transport their registered firearms between their houses and a gunsmith or a trade show, even though they are allowed to transport their guns between their houses and gun ranges. In addition, the legislation would unfairly turn thousands of Canadians into criminals overnight by reclassifying their non-restricted or restricted firearms as prohibited altogether. I am talking about firearms that have been legally imported and sold in Canada for the last 12 years.

There is not a single one of these measures I have listed that would take guns out of the hands of criminals. At the end of the day, criminals do not purchase their guns by going down to Canadian Tire or Cabela's; instead, they get them off the street through illegal means. Through Bill C-71, the government is simply painting law-abiding gun owners—we are talking about farmers, hunters, and sports shooters—as if they are all evil and deserve punishment.

The Liberals' firearms legislation would do nothing to improve the safety of Canadians. There are no concrete measures to combat gang violence or to address the catastrophic increase in rural crime in Canada. Bill C-71 is a flawed bill that would crack down on law-abiding firearms owners and would do nothing to punish criminals who illegally use firearms to commit crimes. This legislation would create a backdoor long-gun registry, requiring an electronic record of the sale of every firearm in Canada. Furthermore, this legislation would remove the ability of licensed firearms owners from transporting restricted firearms to a gunsmith or trade show.

Instead of treating hunters, farmers, and sports shooters as criminals, the Liberals should be focusing their energy on the real criminals, those who actually commit crimes and use their guns illegally. This would be a common-sense approach and the right approach, but the Liberals are not interested in making a positive difference. Instead, they are simply interested in optics. They want to be seen as if they are protecting the Canadian public from gun violence, but in actuality the legislation before the House would do absolutely nothing to this effect.

The Liberals would in fact be making life a whole lot easier for criminals. I will talk about the legislation by which they are doing this. It is Bill C-75. The Liberals are reducing penalties for a massive list of extremely serious crimes, and I will list a few: participating in a terrorist group, trafficking women and children, committing violence against a clergy member, murdering a child within one year of birth, abducting a child, forcing a marriage, advocating for genocide, participating in organized crime. The sentencing for all of these heinous crimes that take place in Canada would be reduced. Those criminals will get off. Meanwhile, the individual who properly owns and registers his or her gun would be punished by Bill C-71, the legislation before the House. That is wrong.

The rights of victims and communities must always come first. A young person in my riding, who has the ability to see the smoke and mirrors in Bill C-71, asked this: Why is the government sending the message that it is okay to punish law-abiding citizens instead of going after those who actually commit crimes?

● (2330)

Canadians are rightly concerned about Bill C-71 criminalizing innocent people.

I have the privilege of sponsoring e-petition 1608, which is currently open for signature by Canadians, and I encourage them to sign it. This petition was started by a gentleman by the name of Ryan Slingerland, who is 16 years old and lives in my riding. He was incredibly upset about the negative impact this legislation would have on his family members who hunt. He was incredibly disgusted by the fact that Bill C-71 would do everything to hinder their ability to be law-abiding citizens and use their guns effectively, and do absolutely nothing to go after rural crime in our area, which is skyrocketing.

Since launching this petition, it has gathered national media attention and my constituent, Ryan Slingerland, has done an incredible job fielding those questions. In fewer than two months, this petition has become the second-largest e-petition in Canadian history, being signed by nearly 79,000 Canadians from coast to coast. Twenty-three thousand of these signatures come from Ontario and 5,800 from Atlantic Canada, thus showing that this is a concern of Canadians from coast to coast. It is not just regional.

When I was in Nunavut this spring, I heard the concerns of Inuit hunters about the potential implications of this legislation. Furthermore, at the public safety committee, indigenous leaders were coming to the table and threatening potential legal action because they argue that the bill would infringe their constitutional rights.

It is important for the Liberal government to recognize that it does not understand the impact this proposed legislation would have on Canadians, which is why the public safety committee needs to travel to talk to Canadians from coast to coast. It is the right thing to do.

I am proud to represent a southern Alberta riding. There are many families who enjoy our heritage of hunting and sport shooting. When I talk to my constituents, they are deeply concerned about this proposed legislation. They want to know why the Liberal government is targeting law-abiding, licenced firearms owners and not going after criminals who are using their guns illegally.

I sat down with my youth advisory board members and got their feedback on the bill this week. They asked that I communicate their views to the Prime Minister. First, they wanted to remind the Prime Minister that he is the leader of the country in which they live, and not the leader of a high school drama classroom. They want him to lead with honesty. They want him to function with integrity. They want him to stop attacking those who own firearms legally. They call upon him to use legislation in a way that is common sense, not nonsense. They ask that this proposed legislation not be used as an emotionally charged response to a problem in the United States that unfairly punishes Canadians who rightly own and use their firearms. They ask that I speak out on their behalf and to ask in particular, why is the Prime Minister skewing the facts and telling mistruths in order to pass this legislation that punishes those who lawfully own firearms?

The fact that indigenous people in this country, the fact that young people in this country, the fact that law-abiding citizens from coast to coast in this country are asking the Prime Minister to sit up and listen to their concerns, the fact that they are begging him to this, and the fact I have a petition that is signed by nearly 79,000 Canadians are all facts that say that this proposed legislation is ill placed. They see that this proposed legislation needs more time. They say that the right thing to do would be for this committee to travel and to listen. It is simply good governance, listening followed by action.

Therefore, I am calling upon the House to take this motion into consideration and to vote for it, not for my sake, but for the sake of Canadians from coast to coast who deserve to have a voice on this topic, who deserve to be treated as law-abiding citizens first and foremost. This proposed legislation, in its current state, would not do that, and we can do better.

● (2335)

Mr. Chris Bittle (St. Catharines, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, a couple of members from the Conservative Party, even though we are debating a motion to instruct a committee on Bill C-71, mentioned Bill C-75 in regards to hybrid-type offences. That proposed legislation provides for a number of offences being turned into hybrid offences, and the Conservatives are saying that the Liberals are soft on crime.

However, I would like to mention a hybrid offence that has existed for quite some time, which is sexual assault. It is one of the worst crimes I can think of, but it was a hybrid offence during 10 years of the Harper government. Is that because the Conservatives were soft of crime or is it because it was good public policy? Which one was it, and can the hon. member have it both ways?

Ms. Rachael Harder: Mr. Speaker, a portion of Bill C-75 is well done, the part of the bill that would go after those who would sexually assault another person. It would protect women and the vulnerable, which is a good part of Bill C-75. However, the bill has many other parts that would allow people who participate in terrorist activities to go free. It would allow people who participate in forced marriage to go free. It would allow people who participate in or promote genocide to go free. It would allow people who participate in infanticide to go free. By "free", I do not mean that they would walk out the door, though that is possible under the way Bill C-75 is structured. I am talking about significantly reduced sentencing, and that is basically free.

● (2340)

Mr. Chris Bittle: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member from the other side gets up and misleads this House about what is in this legislation. Can she point to any part of Bill C-75 that would allow people to get off those particular types of offences? If she can show it, which she cannot, I will vote against it.

Ms. Rachael Harder: Mr. Speaker, I stand in this place as a member of Parliament. I was elected by the people of Lethbridge to represent them. I was elected to stand in this place and to respectfully participate in debate, and in response my colleagues in this place should treat me with respect. The hon. member fails to do so, and so his question does not deserve an answer.

Mr. Brad Trost (Saskatoon—University, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I guess it is my job tonight to possibly calm the place down, but more importantly to bring the time up to 12 midnight as the person who is probably the last speaker this evening.

Mrs. Cathay Wagantall: Mr. Speaker, I am rising on a point of order. On occasion, there is tit-for-tat back and forth, but when I hear the member over there mocking my colleague who is standing up to speak in the House, it is totally inappropriate and an apology is in order.

The Speaker: I call upon colleagues to refrain from commenting when someone else is speaking. I remind members that the hon. member for Saskatoon—University has the floor.

Mr. Brad Trost: Mr. Speaker, as I was reflecting on this legislation and listening to the debate tonight, some of which I enjoyed and some of which I think the House could do without, the one thing that came to my mind was, "Where are the government's priorities? Where are the government's priorities when it comes to legislation, when it comes to protecting the lives of Canadian citizens?"

This is one of the criticisms that was directed earlier tonight at one of the Conservative members: that our arguments were about the waste and the misappropriation of money, and the fact that this will add expense to firearms owners.

I was thinking about that today when I was reading about the opioid crisis that we have here in Canada. Let us compare what this legislation, Bill C-71, is attempting to deal with. In the year 2016, there were approximately 50 homicides with rifles and shotguns. That is what this legislation is really about, dealing with rifles and shotguns and homicides. There were 50. That same year, just under 3,000 Canadians died of opioid drug overdoses. For the year following, the numbers we have, which have not been fully compiled yet, rose to around 4,000.

Let us just think about that. We have legislation. We have a major government priority here to effectively try to deal with 50 homicides. I do not want to, in any way, diminish the value of those human lives. Every human life is precious. However, we need to think about what our public policy priorities are, where we are putting our energy, and we are putting our legislative efforts.

Is it 4,000 people or 50 people? We can and we should try to help people in both categories, but this is something I think the government members should perhaps think about. While they are looking to deal with this smaller issue, perhaps they need to put a more proportionate effort into dealing with the larger issue.

That brought me to ask, "Why is the government actually trying to deal with an issue of approximately 50 homicides per year?" I struggled to come up with an answer. Again, one is too many, so perhaps that is an argument, but the only real answer I could come up with as to why the Liberal government was doing this is the real understanding that the United States has been having its own gun control and firearms issues and the real understanding that when we go door-knocking to constituents and when we talk to them, many Canadians do not understand the differences between firearms legislation and debate in the United States and firearms legislation and debate in Canada.

To me, that is really the only reason that I could come up for why the Liberals are dealing with a comparatively minor problem while at the same time ignoring a much more major problem. I understand that. A lot of Canadians get their news and confuse American with Canadian policy and politics, and that becomes a problem. I would urge government members not to fall into that temptation of just trying to do something to window-dress for a problem that actually does not exist in Canada.

Specifically, today we are dealing with a motion to try to encourage the committee that is dealing with this legislation to get out there, to travel, and to listen to the views of Canadians across the country on this legislation. If we listen to committee members, we hear that they have had a a very abridged debate in dealing with this issue. I think it is important on this legislation.

However, the point has been well made by members of my caucus from urban areas that there are a large number of Canadians, myself included, who live in urban areas and possess firearms and hunt, and lawfully and quite proudly use their firearms. There are very large cultural differences in how firearms are used.

I come from a farm background, so I am comfortable with this. I remember specifically when I worked in Nunavut in the far north. As I have told the House before, I used to be an exploration mining geophysicist. For us, firearms were not just a toy or something to be played with on the weekends. We had to deal with a grizzly bear in one situation, in one area where I was working. In some situations we would have one gun on the block, and, if necessary, a variety of people had to learn how to use it.

I remember one member of my crew, when I was doing an induced polarization survey, telling me how his aunt had actually been mauled to death by a polar bear.

● (2345)

Anything the government or this legislature does to inhibit or discourage the use, sale, and ownership of firearms in the north and in rural areas of Canada can have safety consequences. Widespread ownership of firearms is actually something that makes people safer. While people who live in downtown Toronto or Saskatoon do not often see wildlife that is dangerous, where I worked in the northern territories, this was very much a real and serious issue.

The Liberals are very proud of the Charter of Rights. If a judge invokes the Charter of Rights, the Liberals absolutely follow that path and do not consider using the notwithstanding clause or looking at different interpretations. Looking through my briefing notes, one of the things that came up was the concern that this legislation may have charter issues. For the Liberal Party, which is always concerned about the charter of rights, which they view as one of their great contributions to Canadian debate, I have to wonder why they are not more open to discussing, looking at, and possibly amending this and going on the road, listening to witnesses, and listening to testimony to deal with it.

The political part of me is somewhat glad the Liberals have introduced this legislation, because it reminds Canadians what they did the last time they tried to introduce comprehensive firearms legislation. They ended up wasting millions of dollars and irritating law-abiding firearms owners across the country, something that eventually, as my colleague, the hon. member for Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke, pointed out earlier, cost them many seats. On the political side of my mind, I think this is a good thing. The brain trust of the Liberal Party's PMO will end up costing them seats. It is the same group of people who brought them things such as changes to small business taxes, the Prime Minister's trip to India, and the summer job attestation.

Having said that, this is bad legislation. This is legislation that will continue to harass and cause hindrances for people who want to use firearms for sport, hunting, and their livelihoods in rural areas. That is why I urge all members of the House to vote for this motion to go out across the country to listen to different people, people from different communities in different parts of this country, from Newfoundland to British Columbia and from Yukon to southern Ontario. This is a motion asking Parliament to listen to something that has an impact on millions of Canadians in their day-to-day lives, something that while it is important, maybe has been given higher priority than it should here in Parliament, compared to things I mentioned earlier in my speech.

We are getting close to midnight, and I have another seven minutes to have some questions and comments, because I am not planning to come back to finish my speech on another day.

● (2350)

Mr. Scott Reid (Lanark—Frontenac—Kingston, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have to admit that I anticipated a Liberal getting up to ask a question, but seeing as it is me, my congratulations to my colleague on his well-formulated remarks. I would ask an obvious question.

When he compares what the Liberals are doing by focusing on the rights of legal gun owners, or trying to restrict their rights, with their relative lack of interest in dealing with those who use firearms illegally, what is the policy calculation they are making? It is obvious to me as a rural MP that this alienates the people I represent. What are they targeting? Who are they trying to seek out, and whose votes do they think they are getting by doing this?

Mr. Brad Trost: Mr. Speaker, I think I caught members of the House napping a little bit.

I do not think the calculation is all that sophisticated. Very simply, the government saw a news item from the United States, and it realized that a lot of Canadians confuse American legislation with Canadian legislation. We have a very different firearms regime here in Canada, particularly with handguns. I think the government was trying to capitalize on that perceived need.

The other thing is the obvious political calculation that has been made here. The Liberal Party is trying to squeeze out the NDP on the left, thinking this is the sort of legislation that it can take votes from New Democrats in parts of the country and therefore push those votes. The PMO has calculated that some Liberal MPs are expendable, the ones in rural areas, so the government will get rid of them in exchange for capturing more seats from the NDP.

While my hon. colleagues do not appreciate being written off in the next election by their own leadership in the Prime Minister's Office, I think that is the calculation that has actually been made.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gérard Deltell (Louis-Saint-Laurent, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is never too late to do the right thing, but this evening we have certainly heard both positive and negative perspectives. On the one side are those who absolutely want to protect the rights of gun owners, and on the other side are those who think, rightly or wrongly, that gun owners often have criminal impulses. This is completely untrue, but it is what people sometimes think.

What is true is that Bill C-71 does nothing to address the threats to public safety, such as street gangs, crime, criminal gangs, and the fact that customs officers are not able to quickly detect weapons as they cross the border. This bill ignores these realities, which we must absolutely address if we truly want to prevent tragedies caused by criminals with guns.

Does my colleague think that Bill C-71 ignores the issues that must be addressed if we want to keep all Canadians safe? Does it ignore the issues at the heart of the purported problem with guns and the criminals who use them for nefarious and completely unacceptable purposes?

● (2355)

[*English*]

Mr. Brad Trost: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the remarks that my hon. colleague has made. He has touched on a good point, both specifically and the broader principle.

Specifically he points out that this legislation is about a lot of bureaucratic changes to essentially harass law-abiding firearms owners. That is not the problem. The problem is the criminals, the people who have no intention of taking their PAL down to the local Cabela's and buying a 22, a 270 Savage, a 12-gauge Remington, or something like that to go hunting. This legislation harasses those people who want to do it honestly. It would not do anything to the gangs, to the criminals, the people who buy their firearms on the black market, who buy sawed-off shotguns or small handguns.

The bill speaks to the broader philosophy that is often present in the Liberal government's legislation, that it is not the criminal who is responsible for the crime, but it is broader society. We need to do something to punish or harass broader society to go after the individual criminal. That is a philosophical premise that I do not share.

For people who commit the crimes, who break the laws, their rights should be curtailed. They are the ones who should be punished. We should not try to curtail the rights of broader society, of people who are following the law.

That is the philosophical problem that the Liberal government has whenever it approaches, not just this legislation but any legislation dealing with criminal law.

Mr. Ken McDonald (Avalon, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I compliment the member on his speech. He does not speak often in the House, but his speech was of great interest, and I listened intently.

The opposition keeps tying this legislation to gangs, saying that they will always have their guns. They probably will, but there is the other side of it as well, the law-abiding people who are allowed to have guns and the domestic violence that goes with it.

I mentioned earlier a jilted boyfriend who decided to shoot his ex-girlfriend and her fiancé, and later that night took his own life with a gun. Police at the time did not know the full extent of the guns or the ammunition that he had.

Could the member please tell me what is wrong with trying to provide that information as well when police are getting involved in certain domestic incidents? There have been numerous cases of gun violence.

Mr. Brad Trost: Mr. Speaker, for the amount of effort it would take, what would it actually help with? As I said earlier, we have an issue of 4,000 people per year dying of opiate overdoses in this country, and the government is not making it a priority. We have 50 homicides with rifles and shotguns. Again, that is 50 more than we want, but where is the proof that the bill would actually do anything to help address those 50 homicides?

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

[*Translation*]

The Speaker: In accordance with Standing Order 38, a motion to adjourn the House is deemed to have been moved and seconded. Therefore the question is that this House do now adjourn.

● (2400)

IMMIGRATION, REFUGEES AND CITIZENSHIP

Hon. Steven Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis, CPC): Mr. Speaker, thank you for recognizing me. It is midnight on a Monday night, and we are now beginning what is known as the late show. This is a chance for the opposition to repeat a question that was asked during question period but not answered to our satisfaction. I suspect I will once again receive a stream of indigestible platitudes from the government, but I am going to try asking my question anyway, because it concerns Canadians and people who are being misled right now.

I would like to begin with a quote from the director of the Table de concertation des organismes au service des personnes réfugiées et immigrantes, Stephan Reichhold. A year ago, he wrote, and I quote, "I do not want to alarm anyone"—and I would add, particularly just before bedtime—"but it is quite possible that next year will bring more of what we are seeing right now, with waves of people arriving at the border". An immigration expert told us a year ago that the situation would likely be just as bad this year.

I have some sad news for Mr. Reichhold. The situation is four times worse than it was last year. Some 2,500 asylum seekers crossed the border irregularly at Roxham Road in April. It is now May, so this is very recent. That number is four times higher than it was last year. Mr. Reichhold said that things were bad last year, and now the situation is four times worse. We did not have a problem before the current Prime Minister sent a misleading tweet to the entire world saying, "Welcome to Canada". Since then, Roxham Road has become an international attraction.

Why are we in this situation? First, there are 320,000 foreign nationals in the United States whose temporary status could expire, so one can only imagine the potential pool of people who heard about the hole in the Canadian border. What is more, we now know that people are travelling from Nigeria, Africa, to New York and then on to Plattsburgh, where they receive brochures explaining how to enter Canada irregularly by crossing the border illegally and then file a claim for refugee status. That is the situation we are currently dealing with: 320,000 Americans plus the smugglers who come because of contraband, of course.

The problem is that this is more than just a migrant crisis; it is also a humanitarian crisis. A former member of the Immigration and Refugee Board of Canada, Mr. Handfield, told us that the false information being circulated on the Internet and in the community is complicating the task, that the idea that all those who enter Canada will be given refugee status and allowed to stay is a myth, and that Canada has very strict criteria. Meanwhile, the provinces are the ones who are paying the price. Last week, the Government of Canada offered the provinces a pittance, given that they are the ones who are currently covering the cost of housing the illegal migrants and providing them with services until they receive an answer regarding their claim, which can take up to several years since the system is clogged.

My question is very simple. First, will the Liberals admit that they are the ones who created the problem, because of the Prime Minister's tweet? Second, what are they going to do to address the root of the problem? Right now, they are sticking the provinces with the bill. The provinces are the ones who are paying the price for this Liberal government's and the Prime Minister's mistakes.

[*English*]

Ms. Kamal Khera (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Revenue, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am glad for the opportunity to respond in detail to the question from my hon. colleague.

As the minister has stated, Canada has international commitments in respect of the rights of asylum seekers and refugees. If someone claims asylum in Canada because that person is fleeing persecution, war, or violence, we have a legal obligation to review that request according to international conventions and Canadian laws. Those with legitimate claims to need protection have the right to make an asylum claim, because removal to their home country would subject them personally to danger of torture, a risk to their life, or a risk of cruel and unusual treatment or punishment.

While Canada remains an open and welcoming place for displaced and persecuted people who are in need of protection, our government also remains committed to ensuring an orderly and efficient immigration process.

Although it is an unusual situation, Canadians can be confident that our government is working closely with our partners to ensure that all laws are followed, that the safety and security of Canadians is protected, and that the process of evaluating asylum claims is carried out efficiently, effectively, and with no effect on the processing time of other immigration applications.

As the hon. member is well aware, there is no guarantee that these individuals will be able to stay in Canada. Indeed, if officials from the independent Immigration and Refugee Board determine that they do not have a legitimate asylum claim, they will be removed from this country.

It is also important that this situation is approached through a rigorous but efficient and fast, process. Providing adequate resources for front-line operations is essential.

That is why our government is strengthening our border security and speeding up the processing of asylum claims, through an investment of a further $173.2 million, including $74 million for the IRB. These investments are necessary after the Harper Conservatives cut $390 million from border security.

As described numerous times by our government in the House, we have a plan in place to address this situation. However, Canada will not abandon our responsibilities toward the global community under international conventions. Nor will we forsake our country's long-standing humanitarian and compassionate tradition.

● (2405)

[*Translation*]

Hon. Steven Blaney: Mr. Speaker, as I said, those are platitudes and, unfortunately, falsehoods about an unusual situation. Never in the history of this country have we seen anything like this.

The Canada-United States border is becoming porous. The parliamentary secretary mentioned torture, but this is the United States we are talking about, an allied country, our top trading partner, and our partner in the safe third country agreement. The parliamentary secretary is talking about the border as though the country on the other side were not trustworthy. That is not a very respectful way to talk about our American partners.

As to the falsehood, I have here a Library of Parliament document. There were cuts to the Canada Border Services Agency, and the Liberals were the ones who made those cuts. I know what I am talking about because I was the public safety minister. According to this document, the budget was $2 million in the Conservative government's last year in office and $1.7 million in 2016-17.

That is a $300-million cut, courtesy of the Liberals. The Conservatives did not have this problem at the border. That is not all. The budget for immigration officers was cut by $30 million—

The Speaker: Order. The hon. parliamentary secretary.

[*English*]

Ms. Kamal Khera: Mr. Speaker, as I have stated, Canada has international commitments to respect the rights of asylum seekers and refugees. Those with a legitimate claim to need our protection have a right to make an asylum claim, and that is what makes the asylum system fundamentally different from all other areas of our immigration system.

While Canada remains an open and welcoming place for displaced and persecuted people who are in need of protection, our government is also committed to ensuring an orderly and efficient immigration process.

That is why our government is strengthening our border security and speeding up the processing of asylum claims, through an investment of a further $173.2 million, including $74 million for the IRB, after the Harper Conservatives cut $390 million from border security.

RAIL TRANSPORTATION

Ms. Rachael Harder (Lethbridge, CPC): Mr. Speaker, agriculture production is absolutely essential to the economic well-being of my riding, and not only to my riding but to all of Canada. As Conservatives, we recognize the role farmers play in putting food on our tables and we will always stand up for Canadian farming families from coast to coast. Unfortunately, we do not see that same level of commitment from the current government. This shipping season has been absolutely disastrous for farmers, and the Liberals are partly to blame for that.

Currently there is a blockage in moving grain to market. We are talking about grain for people's consumption as well as grain for animals' consumption, such as livestock. When grain does not get shipped out, farmers do not get paid. If farmers do not get paid, then new crops are not planted; if new crops are not planted, then we do not have the food sources we need for people and for livestock.

Just last week, the Prime Minister was saying he would not use back-to-work legislation if CP Rail went on strike. This left farmers who are dependent on rail shipment high and dry. This is turning into an absolute disaster of epic proportions. Some farmers were not able to plant their spring crops, as they have not been able to sell their grain from last fall. Others struggle to find money to feed their own families without the revenue from their previous harvests. I have heard from many people in my riding and from across Canada, who are becoming more and more worried as to how they are going to provide for their families if the government does not take action.

Not only does this affect our farmers; it also impacts the worldwide reputation of Canada as a grain producer. If we are not reliable in our ability to ship out grain, our reputation reflects that. With each passing week, Canadians are becoming more aware that our Prime Minister is simply not concerned about whether our grain is properly transported or how we are perceived on the world stage when it comes to marketing our produce.

This is not the first time Canadian farmers have faced grain backlogs. In 2014, a similar situation occurred. The difference is that then it was resolved, and fairly quickly, when the previous government issued directives to the rail companies and they began to move grain once again. The Prime Minister and his cabinet members do have the power to speak up and to solve this issue should they have the will to do so. It has been done before and it can certainly be done again. If the government cares about Canadian farmers or Canada's agriculture industry at all, it would step up and do something. It would take action on behalf of the women and men across this country who produce for those of us who then consume.

My question is simple. When will the Liberals start listening to farmers and get the grain moving once again?

● (2410)

Ms. Kamal Khera (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Revenue, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our government recognizes the rail transportation challenges faced this year by farmers and shippers of multiple commodities, including grain. That is why we took action to ensure that railways had a plan in place to recover their service levels and to get grain flowing to market. We wrote to the railways, requesting their plans for restoring service levels, and we have since sustained improvements in the system. We continue to monitor rail performance to ensure that service improvements continue and are sustained over the long term and that the farmers and shippers are able to get their goods to their consumers.

Last year we introduced Bill C-49, because our government is taking action to resolve systematic challenges, not just for this year but for the decades to come. Unlike the Band-Aid solution put in place by the Harper Conservatives, which had an expiry date, we put in place long-term solutions to address challenges facing the freight-rail transportation system and its users. We held extensive consultation with stakeholders from a variety of industries across Canada, including the grain sector. We listened to stakeholders, we heard their concerns, and we came up with a bill that responds to the needs of rail system users across the country. The new and updated measures in Bill C-49 would provide important tools for the grain sector and rail shippers. These include the ability to apply penalties to railway companies who do not fulfill their engagements. The bill also introduces long-haul interswitching, a measure that would increase access to rail services, increase competition among rail companies, and provide more shipping options for grain farmers.

With all these good measures that would directly help our grain farmers, I was disappointed to see that the Harper Conservatives, including the member opposite, voted against this bill. I hope that in future they will put aside their partisan games and work with us to better our transportation system for all our farmers.

Ms. Rachael Harder: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member said, "We continue to monitor". By that, what she means is they continue to sit and twiddle their thumbs. The current Liberal government does not seem to get it. Canadian farmers are incredibly important to the well-being of our economy and to the way we function as a country. Right now, farmers are in crisis because many of them are unable to function at a normal capacity due to the backlog in the grain market.

There are really two options to this problem: One, the government can stand up for Canadians and help farmers out; or, two, the government can ignore the needs of one of the most essential sectors in our economy and sit idle as the livelihood of Canadian farming families is negatively affected. I think this is what the hon. member means when she says, "We continue to monitor". I think she means they continue to sit and watch and do nothing. If that is not what she means, then what actions are the Liberals planning to take?

● (2415)

Ms. Kamal Khera: Mr. Speaker, let me tell the hon. member that we get it. On this side of the House, our government listened to Canadian farmers. Our government continues to support Canadian farmers through Bill C-49, which my hon. colleague voted against.

We have taken action for our farmers and for all rail users. The new and updated measures provide shippers across the country with tools that will lead to a more effective, reliable, and transparent rail transportation system for the benefit of all users. These changes are not just about today and tomorrow. They are about a long-term vision for Canada, one that moves our goods to market effectively and efficiently to support jobs, trade, and economic growth.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Mr. Colin Carrie (Oshawa, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have asked the government if it will kill its punitive job-killing carbon tax. It is one of the largest taxes in history ever put on Canadian businesses and job creators. The government, unfortunately, has refused to answer, but tonight I feel lucky. We have the member for Brampton West over there. We have the House leader. I think they know the answer, and tonight we may actually hear it, because they know that this carbon tax will hurt Canadian manufacturers, hurt jobs, and hurt workers and their families.

Manufacturing is a major job-creator in my riding of Oshawa, and I know that is the case in Brampton as well, but a carbon tax will make companies think twice about investing in our communities. What is not clear is how much it will hurt Canadian manufacturers, workers, and their families. We have asked the government dozens of times to tell us how much the manufacturers and workers will pay in new taxes. Each time, the Liberals have refused to tell Canadians. This is coming from a government that made a specific campaign promise to be open to Canadians by default. That is what it said.

We know that the American administration is moving on policies to make its manufacturers more competitive. The American administration has cut taxes, and it is not implementing a job-killing carbon tax. Our manufacturers are not receiving the tax cuts their American competitors are, and the Canadian steel and aluminum sector now faces new tariffs. In fact, here in Canada, we are doing the opposite by making our manufacturers face a punitive carbon tax. On top of that, the government will not tell us how much it is going to cost. A heavily redacted Finance Canada document shows us that the government knows how much the carbon tax will cost Canadians. The Parliamentary Budget Officer released a report recently and found that the Liberal carbon tax will take $10 billion out of the Canadian economy by 2022, while other estimates say it could be as high as $35 billion. The government has admitted that gasoline prices will go up by 11¢ a litre, and the cost of heating one's home will increase by over $200, but it will not tell us the overall cost to Canadian businesses and families.

In an effort to get some clarity for Canadians, I tabled a motion that would make the carbon tax transparent to manufacturers and Canadians. The motion asks the Standing Committee on Finance to undertake a study on how the government could examine approaches and methods to ensure maximum transparency for consumers related to the costs of carbon taxes, including a requirement for a dedicated line item on invoices and receipts, and mechanisms the government could use to report annually to Parliament on the financial impact, past and projected, of a federally mandated price on carbon on Canadian households and employers.

The government failed to support my motion calling for transparency. What is the government afraid of? What is it hiding? What will the carbon tax cost Canadian job creators and families?

Ms. Kamal Khera (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Revenue, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to rise here after midnight. As the member for Brampton West, I will let the hon. member know that Brampton has one of the largest Chrysler plants. We too support manufacturing. On this side of the House, we actually cut taxes for small businesses. The tariffs announced by the U.S. on Canadian steel and aluminum under the pretext of the section 232 national security provisions are totally unacceptable. That Canada could be considered a national security threat to the United States is inconceivable.

Since the beginning of section 232 national security investigations, our government has been intensely involved in advocating, at every level of the U.S., on Canadian workers' and industries' behalf. Our focus has been on the interconnected nature of our economies and the importance of Canada to our shared security. We are partners in NORAD and NATO, and Canadian soldiers have fought and died alongside our American counterparts.

The Prime Minister discussed these investigations with President Trump and the Minister of Foreign Affairs. The Minister of Innovation, Science and Economic Development, the Minister of National Defence, and the Minister of Natural Resources have all raised the importance of recognizing the special relationship between Canada and the U.S. with their counterparts, to name a few. These ministers, our ambassador in Washington, and our network of consulates in the United States over the past year have repeated the message that our steel and aluminum are not a threat, and that our deeply integrated industries are a testament to the strength of our trade relationship.

In response to these illegal tariffs, our government has taken decisive action to protect our workers and industry. The Prime Minister and the Minister of Foreign Affairs announced our plan to impose, on July 1, trade-restrictive measures against U.S. imports worth $16.6 billion, including countermeasures on U.S. steel and aluminum. This consultation period is very important to us to get the retaliation exactly right. This is the largest trade action that Canada has undertaken since the Second World War, and I urge all Canadians to take a look at this list online and provide feedback.

We firmly believe that these actions cannot go unchallenged, and we are not alone in this. Other partners are taking similar strong measures against these tariffs. We will continue working to advance the interests of Canadian steel and aluminum workers in the auto and manufacturing industries.

I am answering the question asked by the hon. member, but our government believes that the economy and the environment go hand in hand. We know there is a $1-trillion green industry that we have to tap into, and that is something we are extremely proud of.

• (2420)

Mr. Colin Carrie: Mr. Speaker, in my question I talked about tariffs, but I asked if the Prime Minister will work to keep well-paying jobs in Canada, to give Canadian manufacturers a chance to stay competitive, by dropping the unfair carbon tax. Conservatives support the tariffs, and the challenge is that the Prime Minister has chosen not to implement the tariffs for another 30 days.

Ontario right now has the highest electric rates, highest payroll taxes, increased regulatory burden, and increased taxes. Now we have a provincial carbon tax and a federal carbon tax. The U.S. has competitive electric rates, competitive wages, a decrease in corporate tax rates, no carbon tax federally, and no state carbon tax.

We have been asking over and over again how much this new carbon is going to cost and whether the Prime Minister would consider dropping it, bearing in mind that these new tariffs are being put on our steel and aluminum sector. I am here tonight to find out what that would cost. We have been asking, and hopefully we will get an answer.

Ms. Kamal Khera: Mr. Speaker, we actually lowered taxes on the middle class by raising them for the top wealthiest 1%, which my hon. colleague and his party voted against. We introduced the Canada child benefit that is helping nine out of 10 Canadian families and putting more money in the pockets of families that need it. We are the government that, since taking office, has created 600,000 new jobs.

We understand it is working, and that in order for us to continue to grow our economy, we have to include everyone. Our government will always stand up for Canadian workers and businesses.

The Speaker: The motion to adjourn the House is now deemed to have been adopted. Accordingly, the House stands adjourned until later this day at 10 a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 12:23 a.m.)

CONTENTS

Monday, June 4, 2018

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Government Response to Petitions

Mr. Lamoureux ... 20199

Committees of the House

Transport, Infrastructure and Communities

Mr. Badawey ... 20199

Procedure and House Affairs

Mr. Bagnell ... 20199

Citizenship and Immigration

Mr. Sarai ... 20199

Canada Elections Act

Mr. Calkins ... 20199

Bill C-406. Introduction and first reading ... 20199

(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed) ... 20199

Instruction to Committee on Bill C-71

Mr. Paul-Hus ... 20199

Motion ... 20199

Mr. Lamoureux ... 20201

Mr. Motz ... 20201

Mr. Waugh ... 20201

Amendment ... 20203

Mr. Lamoureux ... 20203

Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands) ... 20203

Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands) ... 20203

Mr. Holland ... 20203

Mrs. Wagantall ... 20206

Mr. Paul-Hus ... 20206

Mr. Picard ... 20206

Mr. Calkins ... 20207

Mr. Motz ... 20207

Mr. Dubé ... 20208

Mr. Deltell ... 20210

Mr. Angus ... 20210

Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands) ... 20211

Mr. Motz ... 20211

Mr. Picard ... 20214

Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands) ... 20214

Mr. Calkins ... 20215

Mr. Angus ... 20215

Mr. Calkins ... 20215

Ms. Khalid ... 20219

Mr. Deltell ... 20219

Mr. Carrie ... 20220

Mr. Kent ... 20220

Mrs. Gallant ... 20220

Mr. Angus ... 20223

Mr. Bittle ... 20223

Mr. Reid ... 20224

Mr. Paul-Hus ... 20224

Mr. Carrie ... 20224

Mr. Kmiec ... 20226

Mr. Calkins ... 20227

Mr. Kent ... 20227

Mr. Carrie ... 20228

Mr. McDonald ... 20228

Mr. Kmiec ... 20229

Mr. Eglinski ... 20232

Mr. Shields ... 20232

Ms. Harder ... 20232

Mr. Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound) ... 20233

Mrs. Wagantall ... 20234

Mr. Carrie ... 20234

Mr. Eglinski ... 20235

Ms. Harder ... 20235

Mr. Bittle ... 20236

Mr. Trost ... 20237

Mr. Reid ... 20238

Mr. Deltell ... 20238

Mr. McDonald ... 20239

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship

Mr. Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis) ... 20239

Ms. Khera ... 20239

Rail Transportation

Ms. Harder ... 20240

Ms. Khera ... 20241

International Trade

Mr. Carrie ... 20241

Ms. Khera ... 20242

Published under the authority of the Speaker of the House of Commons

SPEAKER'S PERMISSION

The proceedings of the House of Commons and its Committees are hereby made available to provide greater public access. The parliamentary privilege of the House of Commons to control the publication and broadcast of the proceedings of the House of Commons and its Committees is nonetheless reserved. All copyrights therein are also reserved.

Reproduction of the proceedings of the House of Commons and its Committees, in whole or in part and in any medium, is hereby permitted provided that the reproduction is accurate and is not presented as official. This permission does not extend to reproduction, distribution or use for commercial purpose of financial gain. Reproduction or use outside this permission or without authorization may be treated as copyright infringement in accordance with the *Copyright Act*. Authorization may be obtained on written application to the Office of the Speaker of the House of Commons.

Reproduction in accordance with this permission does not constitute publication under the authority of the House of Commons. The absolute privilege that applies to the proceedings of the House of Commons does not extend to these permitted reproductions. Where a reproduction includes briefs to a Committee of the House of Commons, authorization for reproduction may be required from the authors in accordance with the *Copyright Act*.

Nothing in this permission abrogates or derogates from the privileges, powers, immunities and rights of the House of Commons and its Committees. For greater certainty, this permission does not affect the prohibition against impeaching or questioning the proceedings of the House of Commons in courts or otherwise. The House of Commons retains the right and privilege to find users in contempt of Parliament if a reproduction or use is not in accordance with this permission.

Also available on the House of Commons website at the following address: http://www.ourcommons.ca

Publié en conformité de l'autorité du Président de la Chambre des communes

PERMISSION DU PRÉSIDENT

Les délibérations de la Chambre des communes et de ses comités sont mises à la disposition du public pour mieux le renseigner. La Chambre conserve néanmoins son privilège parlementaire de contrôler la publication et la diffusion des délibérations et elle possède tous les droits d'auteur sur celles-ci.

Il est permis de reproduire les délibérations de la Chambre et de ses comités, en tout ou en partie, sur n'importe quel support, pourvu que la reproduction soit exacte et qu'elle ne soit pas présentée comme version officielle. Il n'est toutefois pas permis de reproduire, de distribuer ou d'utiliser les délibérations à des fins commerciales visant la réalisation d'un profit financier. Toute reproduction ou utilisation non permise ou non formellement autorisée peut être considérée comme une violation du droit d'auteur aux termes de la *Loi sur le droit d'auteur*. Une autorisation formelle peut être obtenue sur présentation d'une demande écrite au Bureau du Président de la Chambre.

La reproduction conforme à la présente permission ne constitue pas une publication sous l'autorité de la Chambre. Le privilège absolu qui s'applique aux délibérations de la Chambre ne s'étend pas aux reproductions permises. Lorsqu'une reproduction comprend des mémoires présentés à un comité de la Chambre, il peut être nécessaire d'obtenir de leurs auteurs l'autorisation de les reproduire, conformément à la *Loi sur le droit d'auteur*.

La présente permission ne porte pas atteinte aux privilèges, pouvoirs, immunités et droits de la Chambre et de ses comités. Il est entendu que cette permission ne touche pas l'interdiction de contester ou de mettre en cause les délibérations de la Chambre devant les tribunaux ou autrement. La Chambre conserve le droit et le privilège de déclarer l'utilisateur coupable d'outrage au Parlement lorsque la reproduction ou l'utilisation n'est pas conforme à la présente permission.

Aussi disponible sur le site Web de la Chambre des communes à l'adresse suivante : http://www.noscommunes.ca